S. Hrg. 100-840

SMART START: THE COMMUNITY COLLABORATIVE FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1988

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDREDTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

S. 2270

TO PROVIDE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES AND LOCALITIES FOR HIGH QUALITY EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS FOR PREKINDERGARTEN CHILDREN, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

FEBRUARY 23, MAY 11, AND JUNE 10, 1988

Printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
89-066 WASHINGTON : 1988

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

5541-9

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts, *Chairman*

CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, Ohio
SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, Hawaii
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
TOM HARKIN, Iowa
BROCK ADAMS, Washington
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, Maryland

ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah
ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont
DAN QUAYLE, Indiana
STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
LOWELL P. WEICKER, Jr., Connecticut
THAD COCHRAN, Mississippi
GORDON J. HUMPHREY, New Hampshire

THOMAS M. ROLLINS, *Staff Director and Chief Counsel*
KEVIN S. MCGUINESS, *Minority Staff Director and Chief Counsel*

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS

Tuesday, February 23, 1988

Page
Blanchard, Hon. James J., Governor of the State of Michigan 49
  Prepared statement 51
Cuomo, Hon. Mario M., Governor of the State of New York 8
  Prepared statement 13
Kean, Hon. Thomas H., Governor of the State of New Jersey 40
  Prepared statement 44
Kennedy, Hon. Edward M., a U.S. Senator from the State of Massachusetts, prepared statement 2
Perpich, Hon. Rudolph G., Governor of the State of Minnesota 21
  Prepared statement (with an attachment) 25
Riley, Hon. Richard W., former Governor of the State of South Carolina 58
  Prepared statement 61
Simon, Hon. Paul, a U.S. Senator from the State of Illinois, prepared statement 6

Wednesday, May 11, 1988

Butler, Owen B., chairman, Subcommittee on the Educationally Disadvantaged, and vice chairman, Committee for Economic Development; and Herrick Roth, coordinating director, Colorado Forum 155
  Prepared statements of:
    Mr. Butler 159
    Mr. Roth 180
Futrell, Mary Hatwood, president, National Education Association; and Althea Simmons, director, Washington Bureau, NAACP 91
  Prepared statements of:
    Ms. Futrell 94
    Ms. Simmons 113
Murphy, Hon. Evelyn, Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts 77
  Prepared statement 81
Pell, Hon. Claiborne, a U.S. Senator from the State of Rhode Island, prepared statement 153
Shanker, Albert, president, American Federation of Teachers; and constance Clayton, superintendent, Philadelphia School District, on behalf of Council of Great City Schools 121
  Prepared statements of:
    Mr. Shanker 124
    Ms. Clayton 139

Friday, June 10, 1988

Bentley, Roseann, president, Missouri State Board of Education, Springfield, MO, president-elect, National Association of State Boards of Education 268
  Prepared statement 271
Bingaman, Hon. Jeff, a U.S. Senator from the State of New Mexico, prepared statement 332
Boggus, Eugenia, president, National Head Start Association, Pittsburgh, PA.. 294
  Prepared statement 296

Page

Cobb, Carolyn, coordinator of school psychological services, State of North Carolina, National Alliance of Pupil Services Organizations, Raleigh, NC 226
  Prepared statement 229
Jenkins, Nancy, vice president for education, California Parent-Teacher Association, La Mirada, CA 239
  Prepared statement 244
Kennedy, Hon. Edward M., a U.S. Senator from the State of Massachusetts, prepared statement 197
Moore, Evelyn, executive director, National Black Child Development Institute, Washington, DC 214
  Prepared statement 217
Pierson, Donald, professor of education and director of field services and studies, University of Lowell, Lowell, MA; former director, Brookline Early Education Project 309
Schweinhart, Lawrence, director, Voices for Children Project, High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, Ypsilanti, MI 311
  Prepared statement 315
Stafford, Hon. Robert T., a U.S. Senator from the State of Vermont, prepared statement 329
Tirozzi, Hon. Gerald N., Commissioner of Education, State of Connecticut, Hartford, CT, Council of Chief State School Officers 285
  Prepared statement 287
Vargas, Arturo, senior education policy analyst, National Council of La Raza, Washington, DC 199
  Prepared statement 203
Willer, Barbara, director, Information Services and Public Policy, National Association for the Education of Young Children, Washington, DC 253
  Prepared statement (with an attachment) 257

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL

Questions and answers:

  Responses of Ms. Futrell to questions submitted by Senator Kennedy 104
  Responses of Mr. Shanker to questions submitted by Senator Kennedy 131
  Responses of Mr. Butler to questions submitted by Senator Kennedy 174

SMART START: THE COMMUNITY COLLABORATIVE FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1988

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1988

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Labor and Human Resources,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:39 p.m., in room SD-430, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Edward M. Kennedy (Chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Kennedy, Metzenbaum, Mikulski, Hatch, Stafford, and Thurmond.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR KENNEDY

The Chairman. We will come to order.

We usually ask members of our committee to make opening statements. If any Senators wish to do so, I hope they will make a brief statement and file their written statements in the record.

We have some distinguished governors representing both political parties on a subject of enormous importance and consequence to the future of our country. All of them have been in town for the National Governors' Conference, and all of them are hard pressed to meet other schedules that will require them to leave.

So I just want to, at the opening of this hearing, welcome all of our governors and express my appreciation on behalf of the committee for their willingness to take the extra time to join with us on a matter which I and other members of the committee consider to be of enormous importance: early educational intervention for the 4 and 5-year-olds of this country. Children in our country are all too often left out and left behind. I am very hopeful that the Smart Start legislation, which I will soon introduce, will offer a helping hand to those who are most vulnerable in our society.

We will hear important testimony that authoritative studies indicate that early intervention programs being tried in a limited way around the country, especially in the states of the governors that are here today offer a dramatic, new hope for young children.

We are fortunate to have with us today governors who have demonstrated records of concern and whose states sponsor active programs.

[The prepared statement of Senator Kennedy follows:]

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY
SENATE LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE HEARING ON 'SMART START' -- A NATIONAL PROGRAM OF EARLY CHILDHOOL EDUCATION

I am pleased to welcome such a distinguished panel of witnesses to the Labor and Human Resources Committee's first hearing on "Smart Start." Each of the governors here today has played an important role in early childhood education, and I am grateful they could make time to be here today to underscore the importance of this issue.

In September, this Committee and the House Committee on Education and Labor held their first joint hearing in twenty years. The subject was economically and educationally disadvantaged children, and that day we heard a disturbing message about the extent of poverty among American children.

But we did not leave that meeting with a feeling of despair -- instead, we felt a powerful sense of hope. We heard from a panel of distinguished witnesses -- child advocates, researchers and corporate executives -- who agreed that by investing in programs for young children, we can save lives that will otherwise be marked by failure and blighted by poverty. They told us that early childhood development programs work -- and work well -- for children who are at risk. They noted that these programs are cost effective, actually saving money in the long run. They found that every dollar spent on early education saves up to six dollars in reduced expenditures on welfare, crime, teen-age pregnancy, special education and unemployment. And they had the hard evidence to prove it.

This evidence clearly calls for action. Many states have already acted, and today we will hear from the governors of these states. But it is time the federal government began to do its share -- so that every child, in every state, will have the opportunity to benefit from early childhood education.

Early childhood education benefits parents, as well. It is no longer the exception but the rule that women with young children work outside the home. More than half of all children below school age now have mothers in the work force, compared with just 29 percent in 1970. The demand for quality child care has escalated far beyond the current supply -- and early education programs can help to fill the gap.

In the next few weeks, I plan to introduce legislation that will combine the benefits of early childhood education with full-day child care, thus serving the needs of both children and their working parents. I call this program "Smart Start," and I have asked these Governors for their ideas about how we can best complement the early childhood education programs in their states.

Under my proposal, schools, community agencies, Head Start centers, and any other organization capable of providing quality full-time care could participate. Each early education center would offer or act as a referral for health, nutrition, and other social services, and would be required to have ties to the public schools. Each would also have to meet certain basic requirements characteristic of successful programs: a low child-teacher ratio, small group size, staff trained in early childhood development, a developmentally appropriate curriculum, and parental involvement.

No state or locality would be required to participate. But to ensure real commitment by those that do, state or local dollars would be required to match federal funds. All 4-year-olds would be eligible, and fifty percent of the places would be reserved for low-income children, who would attend at no charge. Other families would pay what they could afford, based on a sliding scale. The program I envision would authorize $500 million in 1989 and pay 70 percent of the start-up costs, $750 million in 1990 and pay 60 percent of the second-year costs, and $1 billion in 1991 and thereafter, on a 50-50 matching basis between federal and local funds. In addition, the federal funds would be leveraged further, through parental contributions.

By involving state, local and family resources, a national program can be established that will be affordable in terms of the federal budget and achievable in terms of public policy. By targeting low-income children, society will reap the special benefits that early education programs offer.

Smart Start will have many facets. It is an education program, a day care program, a job program, a literacy program, a health care program, a nutrition program, a dropout prevention program, a teenage-pregnancy prevention program, and a crime prevention program.

Most important, it can be a genuinely new American program that will make a significant American investment in a better American future. The potential returns are enormous. Time is being wasted -- and even worse, children are being wasted.

I look forward to the testimony of the impressive array of witnesses assembled here today.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Hatch.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR HATCH

Senator HATCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to join the Chairman in welcoming our distinguished witnesses to the hearing this afternoon. I might say, looking at the quality of these witnesses and the leadership they provide that this may be a little bit of overkill, but it is an important bill.

It's clear that securing our children's future is a strong and mutually held goal, and I think all of us on this committee are deeply concerned about the general unavailability of quality child care, as well as the fact that so many parents have so few choices.

Today, parents are forced to accept any kind of child care that they can afford, regardless of the particular setting, the quality of care provided, or the location of the provider. And it's true that many parents are seeking a child care arrangement that includes an educational component. So I commend Senator Kennedy for attempting to address the desire of many parents for there to be child care that also provides a supplementary learning experience for children.

I might note that the Hatch-Johnson "Child Care Services Improvement Act" would permit such projects as well. There can be, in my opinion, no question that Congress should seriously weigh all of the legislative options in the child care area.

Now, the legislation I have introduced, along with Representative Nancy Johnson of Connecticut, is designed to increase child care availability and choice, and to provide maximum flexibility for states and local entities, not only to address their unique needs, but to do so in innovative ways.

At the same time, we should be careful not to pursue legislation which promotes the segregation of the child care market; that is, a policy that leaves low income families only one set of child care options, which ignores those who are not yet ready for a formal educational experience, or which is so costly that despite the best of intentions, we can never fund it.

The graphics over here illustrate just how important child care has become to American families. Over the last 30 years the labor force participation of mothers has tripled, from 18.4 percent to 58.1 percent, since 1950. Now, we need to correct the myth that wives and mothers are working mainly to buy his and her's BMW's.

The overwhelming majority of women today are working to help provide for their families, either as a single parent as this next chart shows, or as the partner of a husband who earns less than $20,000 a year. So two-thirds of all working women outside the home today are either heads of households or have husbands who earn less than $20,000 a year.

I am looking forward to the testimony of our distinguished panel of governors, and I believe that each of you shares the concerns that I have outlined. I urge all of you to help us fashion the most effective child care legislation possible.

It's also my sincere hope that my colleagues will join me in developing a bipartisan successful solution to these child care problems, during this Congress. Child care is not an issue we can afford to have lost in the sea of congressional promise. So it's time for our committee and, I think, this Congress to act, and I hope we will.

In that regard, I want to welcome again all of you governors who are testifying. We appreciate the effort you have made. We know you have a busy conference going on right now and it's, frankly, wonderful to have you before our committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Mikulski.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKULSKI

Senator MIKULSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to welcome Governor Cuomo and the other governors.

Child care, as we know, is our most important challenge and our most important public investment. We in Washington have found out that the government closest to the people often governs the most innovatively and the most fiscally responsibly, and we look forward to their recommendations and their ideas.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Stafford, who has been the Chairman of the Education Subcommittee of this committee, and is now the ranking minority member, has lived his whole life in the Senate. We welcome you.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR STAFFORD

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief. I do want to welcome the governors who are here to help us this afternoon. Child care is a very important part of the education process in this country. I have long said, and others have, that education is the future of this nation. I have personally felt, and often stated that the Federal dollars invested in education, in all its ramifications, are the best investment that we can make of the taxpayers dollars in this country. So I am favorably disposed towards what may be presented here this afternoon.

In the Vermont tradition, I will stop now and put the rest of my time back on the clock so that the governors can use it.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Senator Metzenbaum, we are delighted to have you with us.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR METZENBAUM

Senator METZENBAUM. Mr. Chairman, day care is one of the challenging problems facing working families in this nation today. As a matter of fact, in my own State of Ohio there are 750,000 children who are in need of adequate day care.

One of the most challenging problems we have is not only to provide day care but to provide adequate day care as well, because the standards that exist in some of the day care facilities are not as high as we would wish. They try hard but they just are not able, within their limited budgets, to achieve the kind of objective that the children are entitled to.

I think this is an innovative approach and I am particularly pleased to see this panel of distinguished governors with us today, and I look forward to their testimony.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Senator Simon follows:]

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR PAUL SIMON (D., ILL.) HEARING BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES ON LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH "SMART START" -- A PRE-KINDERGARTEN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAM IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

February 24, 1988

Mr. Chairman, you are to be commended for your outstanding leadership in holding these hearings and developing legislation to expand the federal role, in partnership with the states, to provide early childhood education for all 4 and 5 year olds. We do ourselves and the Nation a disservice when we fail to give children the opportunity to develop to there fullest potential. That failure is most dramatic at the pre-school stage -- when we have the greatest opoortunity to influence self-perception and their young minds are at the point where even a modest addition can have great impact.

We can surely 'pay now or pay later,' but the need to maximize educational opportunity and employment potential can best be realized by investing in the early years. Recently, The Committee for Economic Development (CED) released its report "Children In Need -- Investment Strategies For The Educationally Disadvantaged." This report broadly advocate rescuing most of the Nation's "at risk" school-age children by improving the schooling offered and "reach(ing) out to these children and their families in their earliest years." The CED study simply confirms what we already know from our experience with the Head Start program and from the Ypsilanti, Michigan study of pre-schoolers who went on finish high school and college, commit fewer crimes and experience fewer teen-age pregnancies.

I am particularly pleased that The Beethoven Project, founded and operated by my friend Irving Harris' Ounce of Prevention Fund, is one of the exemplary projects recognized by CED. It is working in one of the most ecomically deprived neighbohoods in Chicago, Ilinois.

We know Head Start works. We know efforts like The Beethoven Project work. What we need is a comprehensive program, a partnership with the States, and a federal commitment to implement programs at the local level. All youngsters can benefit from the advantage that early intervention provides. The pending reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act includes the establishment of the "Even Start" program and encouragement for the States to spend their Chapter 2 Block Grant funds on early childhood education. I strongly supported the inclusion of these new initatives.

There is still an important place for "Smart Start." We need to expand Head Start and locally-developed early childhood education programs. Despite its proven worth, Head Start only serves 19% of the eligible children and many of them on only a part-day basis. Many of those students who need educational and health-related services the most, receive them the least or have access to programs of lower quality. We also need to involve the states and local educational agencies in reaching the children and their parents.

I am especially pleased to see that "Smart Start" will also benefit parents -- people who are often uneducated, unskilled and unemployed. They not only need to overcome these deficiencies but they also need their hope restored. Learning to read and write, finding a job and being able to help their children learn will restore lost hope.

I intend to become a co-sponsor of this bill and to work with Senator Kennedy to secure its passage.

The CHAIRMAN. Governor, we welcome you here. We understand that you have committed the State of New York to a universal pre-K program. You have recommended doubling the funding for that program in your State. We are eager to hear about it.

Governor Cuomo from New York.

STATEMENT OF HON. MARIO M. CUOMO, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Governor CUOMO. Thank you, Senator Kennedy, all the members of the committee, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you very much for the invitation.

I am going to try to rush through these comments and abbreviate them because the people who will be following me, specifically Governor Perpich, Governor Blanchard, Governor Tom Kean and former Governor Dick Riley, have a great deal to share with you and I don't want to use up too much time.

Let me say immediately that your focus in this committee could not come at a more critical time in the Nation's history, as far as we're concerned in New York. As you know so well, and as you acknowledge with these efforts, there is a staggering number of our children in this Nation, and certainly in my State, who are undereducated, underfed, under-cared for and victimized by drugs, alcohol, and even sex.

The litany of the grim statistics is stunning and is becoming, regrettably, familiar. Today, nationwide, one out of every four children is born into poverty, and that same number holds true in my State, New York. Two out of five minority children across the Nation are poor. In New York State the number increases to a staggering one out of every two minority children are poor.

Nationally, nearly 1 million young people leave America's public schools each year without graduating—1 million. In New York State, one in five children drops out of school, and it becomes one out of every three students in New York City alone. One out of every three students does not make it through high school, making them, probably, nonproductive or worse.

What is there for a 15-year-old girl in New York City to do if she drops out of high school? She does not go to the convent, and she can't get a job. What does she do? What does a 14-year-old boy who drops out of high school in New York City do if he can't work and there is no school for him? He probably gets into some kind of trouble.

There are almost 23 million people across America who are functionally illiterate, and more than three-quarters of a million young adults in New York are believed to be debilitated in the same way. And finally, more than half of all children who live in female-headed families are poor, and the number of those households is on the rise, even—in New York.

Now, thank God, not every child is numbered among those tragic statistics. But as this committee knows, everyone in the community feels the pain, and is made to bear the burden. It is not someone else's problem. The blessed families who are well off and relatively trouble-free do not go untouched by the plight of the children in the mean streets. We will pay the price.

We pay for it in the cost of the social programs that we have to create to address the problems—the drug problems, the crime problems, teenage pregnancy; and we pay in other ways. Consider this, for example: Today's young victims will be the major part of the work force of the Twenty-First Century, and if that work force fails then, very simply, the economy which sustains us all will fail. No one is more aware of that fact than America's business community.

Recently, the Committee for Economic Development, made up of over 200 top-level American business executives, published a report called *Children in Need.* The report said this, "This Nation cannot continue to compete and prosper in the global arena when more than one-fifth of our children live in poverty, and a third grow up in ignorance. Allowing this to continue will not only impoverish these children; it will impoverish this nation—culturally, politically and economically." And the governors say, "Amen."

So if goodness and compassion and generosity weren't enough to make this country encourage attention to the plight of so many of our children, pure self-interest should be. The problem demands a bold and broad commitment of government at every level, in partnership with the whole community.

Now, Senator Kennedy, you and the other members of this committee should be commended by every American for recognizing the need as you have. Let me begin by saying, Senator, that the reasoning behind your pre-K education program mirrors ours in New York almost exactly.

We both seek to increase parental involvement and provide coordinated nutrition, health and social services through pre-K and child care programs. We agree that to the extent we are able to include our poorest children in these programs, we will, thereby, reduce dropout rates and achieve disproportionately greater educational gains.

The Head Start Program, which we both regard as worthwhile, has been an excellent model in this area, proving to everyone that preschool development and education is a good investment in America's children. It has been estimated that the 20-year-old Head Start Program has saved this country as much as $7 in social costs for every single dollar invested. We know that only too well in New York State, and we know it in states and localities all across America.

Your pre-K proposal, Senator Kennedy, would allow us to build upon our own proposed half-day school year program by making funds available for the remaining half of the day, and for the full workday, the calendar year around, which we had not proposed in our State but which your program could make possible.

Let me describe very quickly some of the specifics of our pre-K program. In New York State, over the past 5 years, we have expanded our experimental pre-K program for disadvantaged children—and in the beginning, it was limited to disadvantaged children—to a limited number of school districts. Now, we are moving to bring pre-K to all children, statewide, just as we now support kindergarten.

I have proposed a phase-in program to make State support for universal pre-K education available for 4-year-olds on a half-day basis within the next 5 years. Participation in the expanded pre-K program will be voluntary on the part of both school districts and parents, and our aid formula will distribute larger amounts of state aid per child to districts with lower levels of income and property wealth. So we skew to the people who are most vulnerable, the poorest people in our society. Our pre-K program plans for greater parental involvement, education and counseling, parenting programs that will help parents foster their children's desire to learn.

Now, to follow up on this program in our State: At every grade level, we plan to provide what we call "community schools," schools that are open before and after normal class hours, 12 months a year, with a full range of educational programs, recreational programs, and social functions. Within a decade, every local school district that wants a community school in the State of New York will have that capacity.

In your letter to me, Senator, you asked how pre-K fits into the overall context of our programs for child care, children generally, in New York. Very, very quickly--in this year's State of the State message, I called upon our State to make the next 10 years the "Decade of the Child," and that was more than just rhetorical. We have targeted goals for the next 10 years specifically. We call for a continuous, comprehensive commitment to saving and strengthening New York State's children in every way we can.

We plan to develop and strengthen our programs which we already have: in prenatal, family health care, nutrition assistance, housing programs, child support, and programs addressing teenage pregnancy. We have a program, now 5 years old, I guess, that we call "Avenues to Dignity," specifically, other avenues to dignity. We discovered that children in our State, young women, were having babies because they realized no other way to achieve their own dignity; and we are trying to provide them with other avenues to dignity.

We have beefed up our drug and alcohol addiction programs, and family violence and child abuse programs. This year, specifically, we propose over $60 million be spent for child care services alone. They are used in a variety of ways. Another quick list: low-income child care for families not eligible for public assistance; child care for the children of disadvantaged teenage parents, allowing the teenager to finish high school; transitional child care for working parents who need temporary help before they can pay their own way for child care.

Our child care efforts don't stop there. We provide work-site child care facilities across the State through a joint program with our public employee unions. We have flexible, progressive parental leave policies that the State has negotiated with all of our public employees. We encourage businesses to provide child care services to their employees--we do not mandate it in the State; and we are examining new ways to expand these programs in the private sector.

We have a full range of start-up grants available for establishing not-for-profit, all-day and after-school child care programs. We provide child care resource and referral programs and publications to support and guide parents, and we have established State standards and regulations for the proper operation of child care facilities.

Now, the objective in the State of New York during the Decade of the Child is to promote a full day of services for children so that the needs of single and two-working-parent families can be met. It's our way, we think, of widening New York's historic circle of opportunity. With the Federal help that you propose in these areas, we can do more to the benefit of our State and the entire Nation.

In addition to Senator Kennedy's excellent pre-K proposal, I want to applaud Senator Dodd, Congressman Kildee, and the almost 100 advocacy groups that have worked hard for a comprehensive Federal approach to child care issues. I would also like to commend Senator Hatch for advancing his own proposal in this area. Your initiatives would provide states with the flexibility to pursue innovative approaches to child care problems and additional funding to train child care providers.

I will leave the rest for the testimony we have submitted. I would like to add just one other quick note on a program that I am extremely interested in—almost excited about—in New York State, a program that picks up the child later on in school. It's called "Liberty Scholarships."

You may have heard of Mr. Gene Lang, the New Yorker who got very, very wealthy by his own intelligence and hard work after a public school education, went back to give a commencement to his class, which was now basically black and Hispanic, mostly vulnerable, mostly poor kids, and got an inspiration in the midst of his commencement address.

He said if he could give these kids—who were dropping out of school at a rate of one out of three—if he could give them an inspiration to finish high school, it would help a great deal, so he promised every one of them the wherewithal to pay their college tuition, the I Have A Dream Program.

But he did something else that is even more significant: He promised to Godfather them himself, to be with them, to spend time with them.

In the State of New York, we have announced a Liberty Scholarship Program. It will work like this: Every poor child in the seventh grade—that school lunch program has the designation for poverty—every one in the seventh grade will be told by the State of New York, "If you stick it out, get your diploma, pass the test for college admission to our State university, we will guarantee—if you are still poor—that we will pay your tuition, we will pay your room and board, we will pay your transportation. You may have to engage in work programs the way other students may. But that is our I Have A Dream Program. And in addition to that, we will mentor you. We will have an army of volunteers who will spend their time with every kid in the seventh grade, who will be with you on a regular basis, who will, figuratively—and maybe literally—put their arm around your shoulder and say, "This community loves you. We don't know who else may be telling you this, but we love you." You stick it out in high school. You get your diploma. You stay off those streets. You pass a test for college. If you want to go to college, we will pick up the bill."

It will cost us, the State of New York, $75 million in about 6 years from now. It will be one of the best investments we ever made, as Rudy Perpich will make clearer to you when he relates dropouts and prison, dropouts and social crises.

So, Senator Kennedy, the whole committee, your idea, in my judgment, is exactly right. It is a brilliantly well-timed initiative. Senator Hatch's, Senator Dole's idea, Congressman Kildee's, we are totally supportive and totally grateful to you for recognizing the need and responding to it so intelligently.

[The prepared statement of Governor Cuomo follows:]

Remarks by Governor Mario M. Cuomo

Testimony before the Senate Committee

on Labor and Human Resources

Washington, D.C.

Tuesday, February 23, 1988

Chairman Kennedy, members of the Senate Committee, ladies and gentlemen.

Thank you, Senator Kennedy, for your invitation.

Your focus in this committee could not come at a more critical time in this nation's history.

As you know so well, and acknowledge with your efforts, a staggering number of our children -- in this nation, and in my state -- are undereducated, underfed, undercared for and overly tempted by drugs, alcohol and sex.

The litany of grim statistics is stunning:

Today nation-wide, one out of every four children is born into poverty -- and that same number holds true in New York State.

Two out of five minority children across the nation are poor. In New York State, the percentage increases to a staggering one out of every two.

Nationally, nearly one million young people leave America's public schools each year without graduating.

In New York State, one in five children drops out of school -- and it becomes one out of every three students in New York City alone.

Almost 23 million people across America are functionally illiterate -- and more than three-quarters of a million young adults in New York are believed to be debilitated in the same way.

Finally, more than half of all children who live in female-headed families are poor -- and the number of those households is on the rise.

Thank God, not every child is numbered among those tragic statistics.

But as this committee knows, everyone feels the pain, and will have to bear the burden.

A large part of an entire generation cannot be impaired without severe consequences to the entire nation.

Today's young victims will be part of the workforce of the 21st century -- and if that workforce fails, the economy which sustains us all will fail with it.

No one is more aware of that fact than America's business community.

Recently, the "Committee for Economic Development," made up of over 200 top-level American business executives, published a report entitled Children In Need.

In it, they stated, "This nation cannot continue to compete and prosper in the global arena when more than one-fifth of our children live in poverty and a third grow up in ignorance. Allowing this to continue will not only impoverish these children, it will impoverish our nation -- culturally, politically and economically."

So, if goodness and compassion were not enough to encourage our attention to the plight of so many of our children, self-interest should be.

The problem demands a bold and broad commitment of government at all levels, in partnership with the whole community.

Senator Kennedy, you and the other members of this committee should be commended by every American for recognizing that need.

Let me begin by saying, Senator, that the reasoning behind your pre-kindergarten education program mirrors ours in New York.

We both seek to increase parental involvement, and provide coordinated nutrition, health and social services through pre-kindergarten and child care programs.

We agree that to the extent we are able to include our poorest children in these programs, we will reduce dropout rates, and achieve disproportionately greater educational gains.

The Head Start program has been a terrific model in this area, proving to everyone that pre-school development and education is a rich investment in America's children. It has been estimated that the 20-year-old Head Start program has saved this country as much as $7 in social costs for every $1 invested.

The report I've already referred to, Children In Need, makes the point this way: "Failure to educate is the true expense --

for both society and individuals. The most recent estimates suggest that each year's class of dropouts will cost this nation more than $240 billion in lost earnings and forgone taxes over their lifetimes. This does not include the billions more for crime control and for welfare, health care, and other social services that this group will cost the nation."

We know that only too well in New York State, and in states and localities all across America.

Your pre-kindergarten proposal, Senator Kennedy, would allow us to build upon our proposed half-day school year program, by making funds available for the remaining half of the day, and for the full workday -- the calendar year around.

Let me describe some specifics of our pre-kindergarten program.

In New York State over the past five years, we have expanded our experimental pre-kindergarten program for disadvantaged children in a limited number of school districts.

Now we are moving to bring pre-kindergarten to all children, state-wide -- just as we now support kindergarten.

I have proposed a phase-in program, to make state support for universal pre-kindergarten education available for four-year-olds on a half-day basis within the next five years.

This program will also enhance the relationship between child care and early childhood education, with authorized child care centers able to share in pre-kindergarten funds, in order to expand the availability of full child care services.

Participation in this expanded pre-kindergarten program will be voluntary on the part of both school districts and parents -- and our aid formula will distribute larger amounts of state aid per child to districts with lower levels of income and property wealth.

Our pre-kindergarten program plans for greater parental involvement, education and counselling -- "parenting" programs that will help parents foster their children's desire to learn.

Now, to follow up on this program at every grade level, we plan to provide what I call "community schools," schools that are open before and after normal class hours -- 12 months a year -- with a full range of educational, recreational and social functions. Within a decade, every local school district that wants such a school should have that capacity.

In your letter to me, Senator Kennedy, you asked how these pre-kindergarten programs fit into the overall context of our program for children in New York.

In this year's State of the State message, I called upon our State to make the next ten years the "Decade of the Child," with a continuous, comprehensive commitment to saving and strengthening New York State's children, in every way we can.

We plan to develop and strengthen our programs in pre-natal and family health care, nutrition assistance, housing, child support, and programs addressing teenage pregnancy, drug and alcohol addiction by young people, and family violence and child abuse.

But central to the idea of the Decade of the Child are increased child care services.

While we in New York believe that child care is not a substitute for parental responsibility, in our state -- as in all states -- a growing number of parents with pre-school age children are forced by today's economy to work, in order to adequately provide for their families.

Without the public and the private sectors working together -- to provide comprehensive, affordable child care services -- these parents will be denied the chance to find jobs, and keep them.

In New York State, we are working hard to accomplish that goal.

This year, we propose over $60 million be spent for child care services alone.

Those funds are used in a variety of ways. We provide:

-- Low-income child care for families who are not eligible for public assistance;

-- Child care for the children of disadvantaged teenage parents, allowing the teenager to finish high school;

-- And transitional child care, for working parents who need temporary help before they can pay their own way for child care.

Our child care efforts don't stop there.

New York provides work-site child care facilities across the state, through a joint program with our public employee unions.

We have flexible, progressive parental leave policies.

We encourage businesses to provide child care services to their employees, and we are examining new ways to expand these programs in the private sector.

We have a full range of start-up grants available for establishing not-for-profit, all-day and after-school child care programs.

We provide child-care resource and referral programs and publications to support and guide parents, and we have established state standards and regulations for the proper operation of child care facilities.

And this year, we are proposing legislation that would require transportation between home, child care providers and pre-kindergarten classes, as well as a new program to train and assist women on public assistance to become family child care providers.

Our objective in New York State during the decade of the child -- with our pre-kindergarten and child care proposals -- is to promote a full day of services for children, so that the needs of single- and two-working-parent families can be met.

It's our way of widening New York's historic circle of opportunity for families and children who want a hand up, rather than a handout.

With the federal help you propose in these areas, we can do more to the benefit of our state, and the entire nation.

In addition to Senator Kennedy's excellent pre-kindergarten proposal, I want to commend Senator Dodd, Congressman Kildee, and the almost 100 advocacy groups that have worked hard for a comprehensive, federal approach to child care issues

And I would also like to commend Senator Hatch, for advancing his own proposal in this area.

Your initiatives would provide states with the flexibility to pursue innovative approaches to child care problems, and additional funding to train child care providers.

I particularly support your efforts to develop minimum federal child care standards, including staff-to-child ratios and personnel qualification guidelines.

In addition, I think we need expanded parental leave policies, and flexible schedules for parents in the nation's workplace.

We should also consider Senator Dole's proposal regarding the application of the child and dependant care tax credit. Phasing out the credit to households with incomes above $80,000 would provide $137 million in new revenues for other child care services.

And, we need federally sponsored "parenting" programs, to reinforce and strengthen the family's commitment to education and learning.

Let me offer you one final thought.

It seems to me that Americans are reawakening to the realization that if we are to remain strong, vibrant and free, the world's leader in every way, then we must return to some basic truths.

One of them is that what makes this nation strong is not missiles, but its people -- and that means children.

Another is that the federal government has a role to play in nourishing our true strength, by helping states to help our children.

We in New York are totally supportive ... and deeply grateful to you Senator Kennedy, and to your colleagues, for recognizing these truths, and acting on them.

Thank you.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

The **Chairman**. Thank you, Governor. That's an excellent presentation.

One of the real challenges that we are facing in the development of this program is how to combine the social service aspect with the educational aspect. I am wondering how, in your own State, you have been able to deal with this issue. Has that been much of a problem? Has it been difficult? Has it been a challenge? Has it been able to be worked out in a way that has been satisfactory to you?

Governor **Cuomo**. We are very insistent that we coordinate pre-K with child care services generally, that we make connections between the Head Start Program and pre-K. The Head Start Program in our State is a separate, very successful situation. It has a different orientation than pre-K, but there are many opportunities for coordination. It is, as we all know, a targeted program, specifically targeted to one part of the population. Pre-K goes beyond that.

We coordinate even the transportation so that we can avail ourselves of both child care and pre-K. We regard it as essential to the good management of these social programs that they relate one to the other. If you take the obverse proposition and just, separate all the functions and never let them interconnect, that wouldn't make any sense. So we are very, very strong on making those interconnections.

The **Chairman**. Senator Hatch.

Senator **Hatch**. Thank you, Senator Kennedy.

Recognizing that each State wants to respond in accordance to its own needs to these child care and other problems and to develop its own initiatives, do you think that the Federal Government might inadvertently stifle some of the State and local efforts by setting up program requirements which would apply across the board?

Governor **Cuomo**. Stifle us by doing what, Senator?

Senator **Hatch**. Well, by setting Federal standards across the board, without meeting State and regional needs.

Governor **Cuomo**. We are always—every governor, every local official is nervous about mandates coming from the State capital, and the State capital is always concerned that you ought not to overregulate us. That, traditionally, was part of the aid to education concern. It remains a concern.

From what I have seen in Senator Kennedy's pre-K bill, I am, personally, perfectly comfortable. The Federal Government must have some standards. You wouldn't want to see the Federal taxpayers' money spent recklessly by the State of New York, or any other State, or any local government. So it is perfectly appropriate, it seems to me, for the Federal Government to say, "Look, your ratios have to be appropriate. You have to have a certain education component. There has to be a certain encouraging of parental responsibility. There has to be a certain openness of the program."

We are perfectly receptive to the conditions that I have seen, and I have no concern about being stifled. But we are always mindful that that could happen with a later, less-enlightened administration.

Senator **Hatch**. I suspect that's true.

That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

The **Chairman**. Senator Metzenbaum.

Senator **Metzenbaum**. I have no questions. Thank you. We are happy to have Governor Cuomo with us.

The **Chairman**. Thank you very much. We really appreciate you taking the extra time. We look forward to working with you as we continue the progress in this legislation.

Governor **Cuomo**. Thank you, and happy birthday, Senator Kennedy.

The **Chairman**. Thank you very much.

We are exceedingly fortunate to have Governor Perpich here this afternoon. The Governor is speaking for the National Governors' Association. He has been extremely accommodating with his own time to permit Governor Cuomo to be the first spokesman of this afternoon. He was willing to adjust his own program to permit that. He is the incoming Chairman of the Education Committee of the Governors' Association, as I understand.

In the future, we want you to know—and I am sure I speak for all the members of the committee—we want to work very closely with the governors, as we continue to fashion and shape educational policy here. We know that we will have informed and enlightened leadership in the Governors' Association with you. We particularly appreciate your presence here today. We look forward to hearing your comments.

STATEMENT OF HON. RUDOLPH G. PERPICH, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Governor **Perpich**. Thank you very much, Senator Kennedy.

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the committee, I am, of course, pleased to be here today to share the views of the Nation's governors on a topic of vital importance, our level of investment in the education of our children.

Let me begin by commending your excellent work at the Federal level in assisting at-risk children. We governors share your commitment to this important aspect of education, and will work with you at the state level to provide quality education for all of our children.

In the last 6 years, the States' investment in education—in elementary and secondary education—has increased by $29 billion, or 63 percent. But this investment will be undermined if we are unable to address a growing number of problems confronting our children.

A variety of physical, emotional and social disabilities cause too many children to enter school unprepared and unable to keep up with their peers in the classroom. These children are more likely to become school dropouts, unemployed, welfare-dependent and to engage in criminal activity later in life. The social and economic value of investing in early-childhood education programs to help them is great.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I want to put on an experience I had in chairing the National Governors Association Committee on Dropouts. We found that two-thirds of the people that are incarcerated in this country are dropouts, and three-fourths of them are functionally illiterate.

In our State of Minnesota, 60 percent of the individuals that are incarcerated were dropouts, and over half of the people that are on welfare, again, have been dropouts.

In Minnesota, I am very happy to report, we have a 92 percent high school completion rate, and we have the second lowest incarceration rate in the United States. North Dakota has the second-best high school completion rate, and they have the lowest incarceration rate in the United States. It costs $24,000 to incarcerate a prisoner for one year and we incarcerate about 2,300, a figure that has been roughly constant for the last 10 years. Most states our size will incarcerate well over 13,000. So I feel that we are saving, in Minnesota, a minimum of $250 million a year in prison costs because of the fact we have invested in education and our students are graduating.

Nevertheless, we also find that our graduation rate has been rather constant, 90, 91, 92 percent, so the question we face is how do we get 96 percent completion by the year 1996—a goal I have set.

The only way we can do it is to go at those at-risk children at an early age, because everything else we have done hasn't made that much of a difference in the completion rate. This is why we are so very happy with your efforts—it couldn't have been more timely than it is at the present time. We need that help, and later on I will touch on the costs involved. It has to be a local, state and Federal partnership.

According to the House Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, one dollar invested in early childhood education saves $4.75 through lower special education and welfare costs, less crime and teenage pregnancy and, of course, higher workers' productivity.

The Nation's governors strongly believe that there is a national responsibility to invest in quality, early childhood education and child care programs. We base this belief on two startling trends. Governor Cuomo touched on the fact that one of every four children in this country lives in poverty. The second trend is the growing need for child care services for working parents and, of course, that is very obvious.

The States are committed to doing our share of the work. Nearly half of the states have funded early childhood education programs. In State of the State addresses given this year, 30 of the governors gave a major effort emphasis on early childhood and the family in their speeches. Some strong programs already at work include an "Ounce of Prevention" in Illinois, the "Community Infant Project" in Colorado, "Parent and Child Education" in Kentucky, and "Parents as Teachers" in Missouri.

In Minnesota, we have three model early childhood programs. The first, and one that I am very excited about, is our Early Childhood Family Education Program. This voluntary, statewide program provides services for parents and their children, from prenatal to kindergarten. The key is that children participate with their parents in all activities. It is jointly funded by the State and local communities on a year-round basis, with a sliding fee scale based on family income levels.

In the 1986-1987 school year the program was allotted $18 million, and served a total of 120,000 Minnesota children and their parents. It is a voluntary program and it doesn't work without the parent being there with the child.

Some of the elements that I believe have made this program successful include a stable funding base, licensed teachers to ensure high quality standards, and active advisory councils at the grassroots level to ensure credibility among parents in the communities.

Second, we established in 1977 an early childhood health and development screening program. This, coupled with special education services, beginning at birth, provides a positive start for all children.

Earlier this year, I held public hearings throughout Minnesota to determine how we could further strengthen our early childhood programs. What I heard in these hearings was that we need more assistance for working parents and more quality early childhood programs that are linked with child care services. I have responded to this need by proposing new funding for a series of early childhood education programs. These initiatives are now being considered by the Minnesota Legislature.

More specifically, I proposed an early childhood innovation program to plan and develop integrated programs for all-day kindergarten, early-start programs for at-risk 3 and 4-year-olds, and support services for family day care providers.

I have also proposed voluntary extended day programs in our elementary school programs. These monies would fund a portion of the start-up and operating costs and would subsidize a sliding fee for low-income parents. This program will allow every working parent the opportunity to have quality programs for their children from dawn to dusk.

Another proposal before the legislature calls for additional funds to increase the child care facilities in our technical institutes and community colleges.

I have been in this process, Mr. Chairman for many years, and there isn't anything that has made me feel better than when I've gone to these technical institutes, and seen a parent that has been on the welfare rolls for quite some time, come to school in the morning with their child, during break time, be with the child, have lunch with the child, and go home with the child. These day care facilities open at 6:30 in the morning and stay open until 10:00 o'clock at night—it's all worth it.

We now have 16 of our technical institutes that have these facilities, as well as three of our community colleges. We hope to have these centers at every one of our post-secondary institutes so that we can have people come back to school, especially those that are on the human services rolls.

Our early childhood education proposal for Minnesota also includes an increase in Head Start. That is one of the Federal programs that has been a smashing success. I am sorry to see the cutbacks in the children programs, and we in the states are trying to take up the slack.

Our funding for Head Start is consistent with my belief that programs on the local, State and Federal level work best when they are integrated. We governors feel that State government is in the best position to achieve that coordination and integration. So your proposal is a positive step toward building a Federal/State partnership which recognizes the need to leverage state resources and expand the state initiatives.

We appreciate the role your proposal gives the States in resource allocation and for coordination of all human service programs. In my prepared remarks, I have made some recommendations that you may wish to consider making part of your bill.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate you and members of your committee for taking the lead, at the Federal level, on an issue of vital importance to all of us. Mr. Chairman, you have always been a leader in these areas. I want to close by thanking you for the opportunity to discuss early childhood education programs, and I look forward to a continuing dialogue with you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Governor.

Let me just ask you, really, one question, and that is how you have dealt with the sliding fee schedule for the lower, middle, upper-income people. How do you adjust the fees for those who have the ability to pay, and those that have some ability to pay, and those that haven't got any ability to pay in Minnesota, and how effective has that program been?

Governor PERPICH. Well, our programs have been very, very effective. The sliding fee is really set in the community. They have an advisory committee that is set up through the the local board, and they set up the standards with the county human service boards.

The CHAIRMAN. So is it established locally?

Governor PERPICH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How much contribution would be made by those that are participating, how much will they contribute for those programs? Is that decided locally——

Governor PERPICH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN [continuing]. Or do you have general guidelines?

Governor PERPICH. We have general guidelines but, again, a local effort has to be made by the local subdivision, or the school district, the State and then, of course, the parent, depending upon income. However, Mr. Chairman, I am submitting for the record the exact sliding fee schedule we use in Minnesota for this service for your and the Committee's review.

[The prepared statement of Governor Perpich and the fee schedule referred to above follow:]

National Governors' Association

John H. Sununu
Governor of New Hampshire
Chairman

Raymond C. Scheppach
Executive Director

STATEMENT OF

THE HONORABLE RUDOLPH G. PERPICH
GOVERNOR OF MINNESOTA

Representing
The National Governors' Association

before the

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES
UNITED STATES SENATE

on

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

February 23, 1988

HALL OF THE STATES · 444 North Capitol Street · Washington, D.C. 20001-1572 · (202) 624-5300

Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the Committee, I am pleased to be here today to share with you the views of the nation's Governors on a topic we consider to be most important--education, or as we prefer to characterize it, developing an investment strategy for our most valuable asset, our children.

Let me begin by commending you for the excellent work you have done in establishing and affirming a federal role in assisting disadvantaged children. We Governors appreciate your efforts in the past and are committed to working with you once again in the area of early childhood education.

The states are committed to a continued investment in quality education and assistance to disadvantaged children. In the last six years, state investment in elementary and secondary education has increased by $29 billion or 63 percent. Educational reforms initiated by the Governors in recent years have been motivated by a desire to build a more cost effective and efficient educational system designed to assist local schools to meet the demands of changing demographics and to provide a better quality of life for the next generation.

However, our investment in education will be undermined if we are unable to address a growing number of problems that children are facing. There are a number of factors such as learning deficiencies, lack of school readiness, physical and emotional handicapping conditions, that cause some of our children to enter school with skills far behind other children in the same age groups. Poverty is another key factor in the United States, where one in four children under five years of age is now living in poverty and the numbers are rising. All these children face a greater risk of becoming school dropouts, unemployed, welfare dependent, and delinquent, and have increased needs for special and remedial education programs. The social and economic costs of delaying assistance and investment in preschool child development programs are high.

Projected future demographic changes indicate two startling trends. One is a growing number of poverty-level children in the next decade. Another is a growing need for child care services for working parents. By the mid-1990s, over two-thirds of all mothers of preschool age children, and nearly three-fourths of all mothers of school age children will be working. The demand for child care and early childhood education is expected to grow.

The nation's governors believe strongly that there is a national responsibility to invest in early prevention measures for our children through the establishment of quality preschool education and child care programs.

The states are committed to doing our share of the work. Nearly half of the states have funded early childhood education programs. A number of states have increased expenditures for preschool programs and many states are experimenting with various prevention strategies by increasing parental involvement and focusing more on quality services. State programs range from the Illinois' "Ounce of Prevention", a comprehensive family support program; to Kentucky's "Parent and Child Education", a program that blends early childhood education, literacy training and parent education; Colorado's "Community Infant Project" a prevention program helping to ensure the health and development of infants; Missouri's "Parents as Teachers", a parent education program; and Minnesota's "Early Childhood Family Education" program.

The Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education Program is a statewide parent-child program in which children from birth to kindergarten and their parents participate together. Jointly funded by the state and local communities, the program is offered through the local schools on a year-round basis. Participation of both children and parents are voluntary through registration with the local schools. The local school districts can charge fees based on the parents' income, however, for low-income families, fees are usually waived.

The overall goal of the program is to strengthen families by enhancing and supporting the parents' ability to provide for their children's learning and development and providing opportunities for young children to develop to their full potential. In the 1986-87 school year, $18.3 million funding was provided for this program serving a total of 120,000 children and their parents.

The Minnesota experience suggests several important elements for establishing an effective early childhood education program:

- Legislation which provides for a multi-faceted approach to serve the diverse needs of the population;
- A stable funding base to support the program with high standards;
- Coordination and collaboration with a wide range of community resources, agencies and individuals;
- Use of licensed teachers with appropriate backgrounds and provision of easily accessible, continuing in-service education for program staff, administrators and advisory council members;

- Active advisory councils which are truly representative of the community;

- A belief in local determination and grass-roots efforts;

- A high regard for lifelong learning and the vital role of parents in the education of their chidren; and

- A desire to keep exploring new ideas and approaches with others involved in similar efforts.

Earlier this year, I held public hearings thoughout the state to examine additional needs to further strengthen Minnesota's early childhood education initiative. What I heard from the citizens of my state is that they need more assistance for working parents, more quality preschool programs, and more comprehensive and coordinated programs which link preschool education and child care services together.

In this legislative session, I will propose new funding for a series of early childhood education programs.

Specifically, I have proposed an "Early Childhood Innovation Program," which would use $3.2 million in state funds to plan and develop integrated programs for all-day kindergartens; Early Start programs for at-risk 3 and 4 year olds; Early Childhood Family Education for at-risk families; and support services for family daycare providers.

I have also proposed $1.35 million for voluntary extended day programs in our elementary schools. This money would fund a portion of the start-up and operating costs; and sliding fee subsidies for low-income parents.

Another proposal calls for $1 million in state funds for increased childcare facilities in vocational technical institutes.

Our final early childhood education proposal for Minnesota would increase our funding for Head Start programs by $1 million.

Because integration of programs is so important to our overall effort on this issue, I would like to comment on how your early childhood legislative proposal can best assist and encourage our efforts on the state level.

State government is the only unit of government that can marshall the critical resources in the human service areas at the state and local levels to make certain that various state-initiated and federal preschool child development efforts are well-coordinated and cost effective. States can strengthen preschool child development programs through maximum utilization of the wide range of resources at their command, including health, social services, mental health, education, and nutrition programs.

The National Governors' Association's child development policy states that in order to assure maximum utilization of all available resources, the states should have the primary responsibility and authority to ensure that federally-funded child development programs are administered effectively in their states.

While we believe and support the idea that service delivery must happen at the community level with strong parent involvement, the Governors feel that there are several critical functions most appropriately carried out at the state level: (1) state level planning, including an assessment of the population to be served, competencies of the staff providing such services, and resource allocation; (2) monitoring and evaluation of child development programs; and (3) coordination of child development programs with other state human service programs.

We believe the appropriate federal role in child development programs should be: (1) setting program goals; (2) developing a set of national performance standards based on program outcome for federally-funded programs; (3) assuring equity and access; and (4) providing assistance to special populations who are "at risk" in standard education, health, and social services programs.

Your proposal is a positive step towards building a federal and state partnership which recognizes the need to leverage state resources and expand on state initiatives. We especially appreciate the thrust of your proposal with respect to the appropriate state role in resource allocation and coordination of all human services programs.

There are three areas in your proposal we think can be further strengthened:

- Training of professional staff in early childhood education programs.

  The importance of training professional staff in preschool programs and child care must be emphasized through the provision of federal funds used primarily for training and technical assistance for preschool program and child care service providers at the state level. This approach would ensure that consistent and quality training and appropriate technical assistance can be provided statewide.

- Coordination with other federal human services programs.

  Federal social services programs such as Head Start must be required to coordinate with the state-initiated preschool programs to ensure efficient and cost-effective delivery of services.

- Outreach efforts to serve low-income families.

  Your proposal requires that fifty percent of the program slots must be targeted to children from low income families. The remainder will be made available to all children on a sliding fee basis. We think this is an appropriate way to use federal resources. Special consideration should be given to outreach efforts targeted to children whose parents are recipients of public assistance.

I appreciate the opportunity to discuss early childhood education program with you today. I look forward to continue our dialogue on this issue as you move this proposal forward.

STATE OF MINNESOTA
Office Memorandum

DEPARTMENT : Education

DATE : March 11, 1988

TO : June Alexander

FROM : Lois Engstrom

PHONE : ~~7-2441~~ (612) 297-2441

SUBJECT : Information on Early Childhood Family Education Fees

Fees for Early Childhood Family Education range all the way from no fees (free) to the Robbinsdale sliding fee schedule (attachment #1). Most programs simply assign a fee to each activity but advertise that fees will be waived for families unable to pay. The fee waiver process varies from district to district. Some are based upon the free and reduced lunch criteria; others are simply based on an honor system. We suggest that the waiver procedure used be as innocuous as possible.

A typical fee statewide is $1.50/hour for parent and child together, e.g., an 8 week series of classes each 1½ hrs in length would have a fee of $18.

See attachment #2 from St. Paul for an example of how a district presents this information to families.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Independent School District 281
Community Education and Facilities

Robbinsdale Area Schools

PARENT-CHILD CENTER

Registration for 1987-88

1. The following sliding fee schedule, for a 14-week semester, will be in effect for school year 1987-88:

Family's yearly gross income	1 child enrolled 1½ hour class	1 child enrolled 2 hour class
$30,000 +	$56.00/semester	$74.00/semester
20-30,000	42.00/semester	56.00/semester
10-20,000	28.00/semester	37.00/semester
0-10,000	14.00/semester	18.00/semester

Each family will select their salary range and pay the appropriate fee. Registration will not be accepted without payment. A $5 non-refundable fee will be deducted if you withdraw. Please make your check payable to School District 281.

There will be NO discount for families registering for more than one class. The fee for parents registering twins will be 1½ the normal fee (i.e. $42 plus $21 = $63).

2. It is necessary to register for sibling care to reserve a space for your child. Sibling care is offered to only brothers and sisters of participants. We need to know the day and time your child will be here. There will be a limit of 15 children during any one session. We will register your child first. Any day care children will be accepted after all other registrations are completed.

Sibling care fees will be paid during the first-week classes of the new semester. Sibling care for a 1½-hour class will be $21.00 per semester, per child. Sibling care for a 2-hour class will be $28.00 per semester, per child.

3. New program participants will be required to complete immunization forms for their child. These need to be turned into the Parent-Child Center office.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

SAVE THIS INFORMATION!

NOTE: This information is valid for the entire 1987-88 school year.
SPRING registration dates are March 9 to March 11. Spring Quarter is from March 14 to June 7.

HOW TO REGISTER

Early Childhood Family Education Sites are offering registration on the dates listed above. You can bring your kids and explore the facilities. It's an opportunity for you to meet the staff and ask questions. Registration materials and children's medical forms will be available. PLEASE CALL THE SITE NEAREST YOU FOR DETAILS, **BEFORE** YOU GO TO REGISTER. Check the following pages of this newsletter for more information on open houses, scheduled at various sites. (Complete class listings are included in "St. Paul Families Today - Registration Issue." If you do not have a copy call 293-5275 and one will be sent.)

1. Registrations are first come, first served during the time designated. If you cannot enroll in the session of your choice, you will be helped to find another time or location. We limit class enrollment to ensure safe, productive environments.

2. Families are limited to one regular parent-child session per week.

3. Registration with fee payment is requested.
   a. Program fees cover registration for family members attending a class.

   b. Regular fees are
      11 2-hour sessions - $25.00
      11 1 1/2-hour sessions - $20.00

   c. The following health programs pay partial fees for their members. Please present ID number and receive a discount.
      Coordinated Health Care (CHC) $12.00
      Group Health, Inc. (GHI) $10.00
      These rates apply to 11 week sessions.

   d. Collection of fees is necessary to pay all program costs. However, parents can pay any amount they can afford. **NO ONE WILL BE EXCLUDED BECAUSE OF AN INABILITY TO PAY.**

   e. Installment payments can be arranged when registering.

   f. Non-city resident fee for 11 weeks is $88.00

   g. Special Event fees must be paid at registration. Check with your local site for the registration deadline for each event. Special event fees are not refundable.

   h. Make check payable to Independent School District #625.

4. Late registrations are accepted. **FAMILIES MAY JOIN AT ANY TIME.** Enrollment is limited.

5. Children may attend the program when they have proof tha their immunizations are up to date. Minnesota Statute require that all children entering a Minnesota public o parochial school be immunized against dipthena, tetanus, pertussis, polio, measles, mumps, and rubella. Immunization records must be submitted to the school you child will attend prior to admission. These requirements ca be waived only if a properly signed medical o conscientious exemption is filed with the school.

6. The Early Childhood Family Education program will be cancelled if the public schools are closed. Listen to WCC radio if weather is bad.

7. Classes do not meet on the following days.
   Spring Vacation is from March 28
   through April 1.
   Memorial Day, Monday, May 30.

8. **For more information, call the Early Childhood Famil Education Center in your area or 293-5275.**

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Hatch.

Senator HATCH. Thank you.

Governor Perpich, we are happy to have you here, and I appreciated your comments. I read your statement and listened as you were chatting about it. I was interested to find that State investment in elementary and secondary education has increased by $29 billion, or over 63 percent in the last 6 years. So the States have been putting a lot of money in education.

Governor PERPICH. Absolutely. There is more and more of an emphasis on education, with the recognition that the low paying jobs are going to East Asia, and you have to have people that are well prepared for the jobs of the future. That started it.

Senator HATCH. Sure. But the important thing is that the States are doing a pretty good job in education, as they have always done. I think you make that case very well here. You also point out that nearly half of the States have funded early childhood education programs.

I am hopeful we will do child care legislation this year—there's no reason why we shouldn't since this is an election year. It's a very apt time to do it and, frankly, I think some of our conservatives are willing to start looking at this with real seriousness. I think that if we can bring a consensus, a bipartisan consensus together, we can pass something that this President will sign into law.

Governor PERPICH. Senator, in the National Governors Association we have a consensus. NGA is both Democrats and Republican, conservatives and liberals, all in support of the program in early childhood.

Senator HATCH. Well, that's good. I think so, too.

I have also noted that throughout this you have indicated that the States have a role. They really are the people that can put this multifaceted approach together; that, literally, as you say, State government is the only unit of government that can marshal the critical resources in the human service areas at the State and local levels to make certain that various state-initiated and Federal preschool child development programs are well coordinated and cost-effective. You believe that, don't you?

Governor PERPICH. Yes.

Senator HATCH. Well, I do, too.

What I am concerned about is if we have child care and we set national standards, it may not take into consideration the needs of the state and local areas, that they may turn out to the detriment of certain state and local areas rather than to the benefit of everybody. I would prefer to see these standards set by parent advisory councils under the direction of State and local governments, in the State and local government area.

I don't know what you feel, but I would like to get your viewpoint on it.

Governor PERPICH. Well, I think we can work it as a partnership, much like we're doing with local government. There are certain standards that we're requiring of the locals in the early childhood education program I mentioned earlier. It is obvious that they are accepting that because of the broad public support—120,000 children participating in Minnesota. That's a lot of people in a small

State of about 4.25 million. And I believe the same partnership can work with the Federal Government.

Senator Hatch. Well, what can the Federal Government do to encourage more creative state and local leadership in this area?

Governor Perpich. Well, in the bill itself you talk about wealth as being a part of it. I think that has to be a part of it. I think you have to have certain minimum standards—I can just see some states maybe saying, "You're going to have 20 or 30 in a class." I don't know how far they would go. I think you have to have that type of standard.

We have to require it, as a state to the local, but in Minnesota we worked it out with the locals. We set up these advisory commissions, and it works. I think the fact that you have five governors here, from both parties that want to be a part of this bill, shows that if we work this through together, it will work.

Senator Hatch. All right. What was the major impetus for these individual states to initiate and devote substantial state resources to these programs on their very own, even before the Federal Government picked up the issues and picked up the——

Governor Perpich. Well, I think it came from the private sector. The private sector was concerned that we have individuals that are well prepared and well trained, and they are concerned about productivity and being competitive. Then the next was, how do we improve on it.

As I said earlier, it became obvious to me that we weren't going to improve on it unless we get to the preschoolers, that we are still going to have about 8 or 10 percent of our population that will be dropping out of school, and that is where we are having our problems. As I said, 60 percent that are incarcerated in Minnesota are dropouts, and I think that is what is happening in all of the States. They are recognizing the importance of education.

I don't look at our investment in education as an expense—it is literally an investment. I think Minnesota has proven that—we're saving, $250 million a year. You know, we have fewer peace officers on a per capita basis than any state in the Union. Now, why is that? And why have we had only 2,300, prisoners—that is about the maximum that we have incarcerated.

Some people speak about the crime rate in our nation escalating I was Governor 10 years ago and we had the same number incarcerated then as today. We're not putting dollars into our correctional facilities, and we have no problem in those facilities, by the way—again, because of the effort as far as education.

Senator Hatch. Well, this is the last question I will ask, but I think, really, that it is important to note that the States have not ignored the needs of their citizens.

Governor Perpich. No.

Senator Hatch. They haven't sat around waiting for the Federal Government to come up with solutions, although you welcome reasonable solutions that the Federal Government can offer. We appreciate that. I think you have made a pretty good case for education, and certainly for preschool education and, really, child care in general. So I just want to, again, express my appreciation for you being here.

Governor PERPICH. Senator Hatch, to give you another example: We feel that if we are going to break that poverty cycle and get people off from the human service rolls we just have to keep them in school or some other educational program.

Well, we worked for two years to get the Federal Government to say—what we want to do is, if you want to get that check at the end of the month, you have to be in the school. I'm talking now about a parent with a child. But that parent has to be in school in order to get the check at the end of the month. Well, we just got the preliminary approval, and it will be July before we get the final approval to be sure that we have these programs working.

I believe that you should look at this as a partnership. That is how we looked at it with the local. I hope that we can work this as a partnership, and I think we'll have a very successful program.

Senator HATCH. Thank you, sir. I appreciate having you here.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. I know you will continue to be active in the education field, and we will look forward to your ideas.

Governor PERPICH. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. We will welcome Governor Thomas Kean back to our Human Resources Committee. He is becoming a well-known expert witness before our committee. He was good enough to come down and share his knowledge with our Education Subcommittee on professional teaching standards just about a week or so ago. He has been the former Chairman of the National Governors' Association Subcommittee on Education, and of the Education Commission of the states. He has worked very closely with our committee over a number of years, and we are glad to have him back here this afternoon. We look forward to hearing from him.

Before we hear from Governor Kean, I want to recognize the Senator from South Carolina and welcome him to the committee. We know he has been making some news today, but we are glad to welcome him here to the meeting of our committee to hear our governors this afternoon.

Governor, we will recognize you, if you will share with us your thoughts.

STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS H. KEAN, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Governor KEAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, Senator Hatch, Senator Thurmond.

I appreciate very, very much the chance to speak before this committee today.

It was Plato who gave a lot of thought to the rearing of young people and who once wrote that the direction in which education starts a man will determine his future life. Good schools, able teachers, as we all know, can be a young person's salvation. They can point a young boy or girl toward a life of hope, happiness and, of course, in this democracy of ours, achievement.

But what of the children who get off to a poor start in life, who lag behind their peers even before that first school bell rings? One in five of our children today live below that poverty line. Poverty can cripple those children, making them fit only for a life that ends up in crime or in a welfare hotel, watching as the rest of us march on by.

I think it is time we asked people how they would feel if these prospects were presented to their own children. Well, the truth is, these are all our children. We are as tied to the future of that little girl from Watts and the little boy from Bedford-Stuyvesant as we are to our own sons and our own daughters. We have a moral obligation to give them the opportunity to grow and develop to their highest potential, and America has a vital interest in seeing them succeed.

On the face of it, then, there should be nothing simpler than providing a good education for children before they even get to kindergarten. All the research says it's a good idea. We've got the most wonderful model in the world in Head Start. You would think that all that we would need is a little more money. But it's just not that simple.

The people who nurture our young children must meet the needs of the whole child the same way a parent has to meet the needs of the whole child and, today, that happens, for many of our children, very, very rarely. Experienced people who care deeply about our young children find it very difficult to talk to one another.

For too long, our best child development specialists, mainly in the Head Start Program, have simply not even talked with our best educators. And for too long, our educators, occupied with the problems of K through 12, have not had the opportunity to reach out to younger children. Somehow, now, we have to bring these people together.

In New Jersey, we are launching a new pilot program. It is founded on the premise that while we must spend more money on early childhood education, not all solutions begin with a dollar sign. We are going to put $10 million towards two proven performers: the Head Start Program, and our New Jersey schools. This money will pay for early childhood development programs for about 2,500 urban 3- and 4-year-olds.

For these children, we will offer a six-hour education program. That is double the amount of care now available in the average Head Start Program. If a child needs additional care, we are ready to provide it, before and after school. Our new centers will also provide counseling for families and help them get food stamps or health care, if that is a problem for that family.

All of these programs are going to be located right in the public schools. Some will be jointly designed and managed by the Head Start agencies and the local school boards. Some will be run by the schools alone. That means we will be able to study several different types of programs to see which is the best way to expand child care programs in the future.

I would be stretching the truth, I guess, if I told you that everybody was happy with this arrangement. But we have about as much need for turf battles in our preschools as we have for gang wars in our city streets. The truth is that it is time, at long last, for adults to cooperate for the children's sake.

Teachers and Head Start operators must start talking to one another. They must take a common interest in the children they serve and they must search for better ways to do their jobs together. As they develop those better ways, New Jersey will be there to support their efforts. We are going to let them follow their vision for a healthy environment where children can learn. We are going to set guidelines for their programs, but we are not going to strangle their creativity by trying to put on particularly onerous regulations.

At the same time, we are going to demand results. We are going to evaluate each program to see how well it does in preparing youngsters for school. Those that succeed are going to be refunded and expanded. Those that fail will not be.

Our theory of early childhood education is based on one premise: that the people who work with our children see the whole child, not just the education part, nor solely the social service part. Children in early childhood programs are not products to be completed at different phases in an assembly line. They require total care—the same kind of care that any of us who are parents try to give to our own children.

Senator Kennedy, we like so much many of the thoughts and ideas behind your draft bill as it stands right now. It allows for responsible flexibility. It encourages collaboration between the schools and Head Start. I am especially pleased that this committee is moving forward on the national stage to craft an early education strategy.

But I am also aware that you are at the beginning of what I know is going to be a very long process—that advocacy groups are going to be here, and political forces are going to be pulling at you from all sides; all with good intentions, and all for the sake of the children—at least as they see it.

As you begin your vital work, I would just ask you to keep several things in mind. For one thing, don't create new mechanisms and new bureaucracies and think, necessarily, that those are going to improve children's lives. We already have successful programs—Head Start is the best example. Let's see if we can build on what we've got. It's the only way to ensure that our children get the most for the money that we are investing.

The second thing is that as you proceed with your legislation, give the states the flexibility to develop programs that will best serve the children, whether it be city children, or rural children, or suburban children.

Now, I know it seems that we are always coming here as governors to ask for Federal money with no strings attached. But that's not really what I'm saying. I am simply saying that the people at the local level are, after all, the closest to the children. They know what's best for them and we should give them the freedom to create the best programs to meet those children's needs.

Then, finally, after you have encouraged flexibility and creativity, you simply must insist on accountability. Methods are fine, but results—results are, after all, what really matter.

This is the approach the members of this committee took on the reauthorization of Chapter I, and I certainly commend you for your vision. These are the principles that have guided development of our projects in New Jersey. I think they are essential to the success of a Federal venture. I urge you, please, don't proceed without them.

We have so many worthwhile Federal programs like Head Start and Chapter I, and they are competing these days for very scarce funds. I would rather see you put your energies into nurturing these proven winners than proceed with a bill that departs from the basic principles which have already proved successful.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Governor Kean follows:]

REMARKS OF GOVERNOR THOMAS H. KEAN

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE SENATE LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE ON EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

WASHINGTON, D. C.

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1988

GOOD AFTERNOON, MISTER CHAIRMAN, AND THANK YOU FOR ASKING ME TO SPEAK BEFORE THIS COMMITTEE TODAY.

PLATO, WHO GAVE A LOT OF THOUGHT TO THE REARING OF YOUNG PEOPLE, ONCE WROTE THAT "THE DIRECTION IN WHICH EDUCATION STARTS A MAN WILL DETERMINE HIS FUTURE LIFE."

BUT WHAT OF THE CHILDREN WHO GET OFF TO A POOR START IN LIFE, WHO LAG BEHIND THEIR PEERS EVEN BEFORE THE FIRST BELL FOR KINDERGARTEN HAS RUNG?

ONE IN FIVE OF OUR CHILDREN TODAY LIVES BELOW THE POVERTY LINE. POVERTY CAN CRIPPLE THOSE CHILDREN, MAKING THEM FIT ONLY FOR A LIFE OF CRIME OR FOR STARING OUT WELFARE HOTEL WINDOWS AS THE WORLD MARCHES BY.

I ASK YOU... HOW WOULD YOU FEEL IF THESE WERE THE PROSPECTS PRESENTED TO YOUR OWN CHILDREN?

WELL, THE TRUTH IS, THESE ARE YOUR CHILDREN, OUR CHILDREN. WE ARE AS TIED TO THE FUTURE OF THE LITTLE GIRL FROM WATTS AND THE LITTLE BOY FROM BEDFORD-STUYVESANT AS WE ARE TO OUR OWN SONS AND DAUGHTERS.

WE HAVE A MORAL OBLIGATION TO GIVE THEM THE OPPORTUNITY TO GROW AND DEVELOP TO THEIR HIGHEST POTENTIAL, AND AMERICA HAS A VITAL INTEREST IN SEEING THEM SUCCEED.

ON THE FACE OF IT, IT SEEMS THAT THERE SHOULD BE NOTHING SIMPLER THAN PROVIDING GOOD EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN BEFORE THEY GET TO KINDERGARTEN. ALL THE RESEARCH SAYS IT'S A GOOD IDEA. AND HEADSTART IS A WONDERFUL MODEL.

YOU'D THINK ALL WE WOULD NEED IS MORE MONEY. BUT IT'S NOT AS SIMPLE AS THAT. THE PEOPLE WHO NURTURE OUR YOUNG CHILDREN MUST MEET THE NEEDS OF THE WHOLE CHILD, AS A PARENT WOULD. AND TODAY THAT IS HAPPENING ALL TOO RARELY.

EXPERIENCED PEOPLE WHO CARE DEEPLY ABOUT OUR YOUNG CHILDREN FIND IT HARD TO TALK TO ONE ANOTHER. FOR TOO LONG OUR BEST CHILD DEVELOPMENT SPECIALISTS, MAINLY IN THE HEADSTART PROGRAM, HAVE BEEN UNTAPPED RESOURCES FOR OUR EDUCATORS.

AND FOR TOO LONG OUR EDUCATORS, OCCUPIED WITH THE PROBLEMS OF K-THROUGH-12, HAVE NOT HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO REACH OUT TO YOUNGER CHILDREN. WE MUST SEARCH FOR WAYS TO BRING THESE PEOPLE TOGETHER.

IN NEW JERSEY WE ARE LAUNCHING A NEW PILOT PROGRAM.

IT IS FOUNDED ON THE PREMISE THAT WHILE WE MUST SPEND MORE MONEY ON EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION, NOT ALL SOLUTIONS BEGIN WITH A DOLLAR SIGN.

WE WILL PUT $10 MILLION TOWARD TWO PROVEN PERFORMERS: THE HEAD START PROGRAM AND NEW JERSEY'S SCHOOLS. THIS MONEY WILL PAY FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS FOR 2,500 URBAN THREE AND FOUR YEAR OLDS.

FOR THESE CHILDREN WE WILL OFFER A SIX HOUR EDUCATION PROGRAM. THAT IS DOUBLE THE AMOUNT OF TIME NOW AVAILABLE IN MOST HEAD START PROGRAMS.

IF A CHILD NEEDS ADDITIONAL CARE, WE WILL PROVIDE IT -- BEFORE AND AFTER SCHOOL. OUR NEW CENTERS WILL ALSO PROVIDE COUNSELING FOR FAMILIES AND HELP THEM GET FOOD STAMPS OR HEALTH CARE, IF THEY NEED IT.

ALL OF THESE PROGRAMS WILL BE LOCATED AT PUBLIC SCHOOLS. SOME WILL BE JOINTLY DESIGNED AND MANAGED BY THE HEAD START AGENCIES AND THE LOCAL SCHOOL BOARDS; SOME BY THE SCHOOLS ALONE.

THAT MEANS WE WILL BE ABLE TO STUDY SEVERAL DIFFERENT TYPES OF PROGRAMS TO SEE WHICH IS THE BEST WAY TO EXPAND CHILD CARE PROGRAMS IN THE FUTURE.

I WOULD BE STRETCHING THE TRUTH IF I TOLD YOU THAT EVERYONE IS HAPPY ABOUT THIS ARRANGEMENT. BUT WE HAVE ABOUT AS MUCH NEED FOR TURF BATTLES IN OUR PRE-SCHOOLS AS WE HAVE FOR GANG WARS IN OUR HIGH SCHOOLS.

THE TRUTH IS, IT'S TIME ADULTS LEARNED TO COOPERATE, FOR THE CHILDREN'S SAKE.

TEACHERS AND HEADSTART OPERATORS MUST TALK TO EACH OTHER. THEY MUST TAKE A COMMON INTEREST IN THE CHILDREN THEY SERVE. AND THEY MUST SEARCH FOR BETTER WAYS TO DO THEIR JOBS -- TOGETHER.

AS THEY DEVELOP THOSE BETTER WAYS, NEW JERSEY WILL SUPPORT THEIR EFFORTS. WE WILL LET THEM FOLLOW THEIR VISION FOR A HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT WHERE CHILDREN CAN LEARN. WE WILL SET GUIDELINES FOR THEIR PROGRAMS, BUT WE WILL NOT STRANGLE THEIR CREATIVITY WITH ONEROUS REGULATIONS.

AT THE SAME TIME, WE WILL DEMAND RESULTS. WE WILL EVALUATE EACH PROGRAM TO SEE HOW WELL IT DOES IN PREPARING YOUNGSTERS FOR SCHOOL. THOSE THAT SUCCEED WILL BE REFUNDED. THOSE THAT DO NOT, WILL NOT.

OUR THEORY OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION IS BASED ON ONE PREMISE: THAT THE PEOPLE WHO WORK WITH OUR CHILDREN SEE THE WHOLE CHILD, NOT THE "EDUCATION" PART OR THE "SOCIAL SERVICES" PART.

CHILDREN IN EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS ARE NOT PRODUCTS TO BE COMPLETED AT DIFFERENT PHASES OF THE ASSEMBLY LINE. THEY REQUIRE TOTAL CARE, THE CARE THAT PARENTS GIVE TO THEIR OWN CHILDREN.

SENATOR KENNEDY, I LIKE MANY OF THE THOUGHTS AND IDEAS BEHIND YOUR DRAFT BILL AS IT STANDS RIGHT NOW. IT ALLOWS FOR RESPONSIBLE FLEXIBILITY. IT ENCOURAGES COLLABORATION BETWEEN THE SCHOOLS AND HEADSTART. AND I AM ESPECIALLY PLEASED THAT THIS COMMITTEE IS MOVING FORWARD ON THE NATIONAL LEVEL TO FASHION AN EARLY EDUCATION STRATEGY.

BUT I AM ALSO AWARE THAT YOU ARE AT THE BEGINNING OF A LONG PROCESS... THAT ADVOCACY GROUPS AND POLITICAL FORCES WILL BE PULLING AT YOU FROM ALL SIDES, ALL WITH GOOD INTENTIONS AND ALL FOR THE SAKE OF THE CHILDREN, AS THEY SEE IT.

AS YOU BEGIN YOUR VITAL WORK, I ASK YOU TO KEEP SEVERAL THINGS IN MIND.

FOR ONE THING, DON'T CREATE NEW MECHANISMS AND BUREAUCRACIES AND THINK YOU ARE IMPROVING CHILDREN'S LIVES. WE ALREADY HAVE SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS LIKE HEAD START. LET'S BUILD ON WHAT WE'VE GOT. IT'S THE ONLY WAY TO INSURE OUR CHILDREN GET THE MOST FOR OUR MONEY.

THE SECOND THING IS THAT AS YOU PROCEED WITH YOUR LEGISLATION, GIVE THE STATES THE FLEXIBILITY TO DEVELOP PROGRAMS THAT BEST SERVE THE CHILDREN.

NOW, I KNOW IT SEEMS THAT GOVERNORS ARE ALWAYS COMING TO WASHINGTON TO ASK FOR FEDERAL MONEY WITH NO STRINGS ATTACHED. BUT THAT IS NOT WHAT I AM SAYING.

I AM SIMPLY SAYING THAT THE PEOPLE AT THE LOCAL LEVEL ARE THE CLOSEST TO THE CHILDREN. THEY KNOW WHAT IS BEST FOR THEM. YOU SHOULD GIVE THEM THE FREEDOM TO CREATE THE BEST PROGRAMS TO MEET CHILDREN'S NEEDS.

AND THEN FINALLY, AFTER YOU HAVE ENCOURAGED FLEXIBILITY AND CREATIVITY, INSIST ON ACCOUNTABILITY. METHODS ARE FINE, BUT RESULTS ARE WHAT REALLY MATTER. THIS IS THE APPROACH THE MEMBERS OF THIS COMMITTEE TOOK ON THE REAUTHORIZATION OF CHAPTER I AND I COMMEND YOU FOR YOUR VISION.

THESE ARE THE PRINCIPLES THAT HAVE GUIDED THE DEVELOPMENT OF OUR NEW JERSEY PROJECT. I THINK THEY ARE ESSENTIAL TO THE SUCCESS OF ANY FEDERAL VENTURE.

I URGE YOU -- DON'T PROCEED WITHOUT THEM.

WE HAVE MANY WORTHWHILE FEDERAL PROGRAMS LIKE HEADSTART AND CHAPTER I WHICH ARE COMPETING FOR SCARCE FUNDS. I WOULD RATHER SEE YOU PUT YOUR ENERGIES INTO NURTURING THESE PROVEN WINNERS THAN PROCEED WITH A BILL THAT DEPARTS FROM THESE BASIC PRINCIPLES.

THANK YOU.

The **Chairman**. Thank you, Governor, for that excellent testimony. I suppose you put your finger on an important issue, and that is how you would deal with those that are primarily concerned with day care and those that are primarily concerned with education.

Granted, as you expressed so well, it is the blend of those programs that we are really, essentially, trying to establish by encouraging innovativeness by the State in including the educational function, the day care function, the health function, and parental involvement.

What can we learn from your experience as a governor that would be of value for us as we try to come to grips with this particular challenge?

Governor **Kean**. I was surprised, frankly, Senator, when the Commissioner of Education came to me and first started talking about preschool education. He had not thought about Head Start because the schools are not involved in that program. And when you talked to the social services people, they hadn't really thought of the school component, how they could do a better job in the traditional education of those particular kids.

These two groups of people are not comfortable with each other. It's a very difficult and strained relationship. They are two different groups of people—good people—but with different systems, who have been working in different ways, and with different ways of looking at the world. But they have enormous common ground-that's what we found when we, in a sense, forced them together.

We found that they had all devoted their lives to children. They were all speaking the same language, in many ways, and their common ground, both their ideals and their experiences, had so much in common that they soon came together.

So they are working together very successfully in New Jersey now. But we had to find ways, both in the legislation we proposed at the state level and also, frankly, through my office, of bringing these people into the same room and making them devise programs together.

The **Chairman**. We will take your word for that and continue to consult with you as we move through that thicket because you have had, obviously, successful programs. We want to learn from those that have been successful.

We want to thank you very much for your appearance here and for your strong support.

Governor **Kean**. Thank you, Senator, and for your leadership.

The **Chairman**. It's good to welcome Governor Blanchard here this afternoon. I am particularly grateful to him for readjusting and changing his program. I welcome the fact that he has had the opportunity to listen to a good deal of the testimony because I hope he will focus on the general issues and also on those other issues about which we have inquired—I've inquired of the various witnesses about what is appropriate for the Federal Government to require, how the States ought to look at it, and how we bring various components together, because that is the essence of a successful program.

That particular issue has been one which the Governor is very familiar with. He has spoken to members of this committee as we have worked together, whether it has been the Job Partnership Act or other pieces of legislation about that particular relationship, and we have always benefitted from his interventions in that area.

So we will look forward to his general comments and then, hopefully, he will focus in on that issue as well. You can see from the questioning, Senator Hatch and the others, what is of primary interest to the members of the committee, so we will be looking forward to hearing from you this afternoon.

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES J. BLANCHARD, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

Governor **Blanchard**. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, Senator Kennedy.

All I can tell you is, Tom Kean sure sounded like a Democrat up here, didn't he, and that's why——

The **Chairman**. Well, he's had some good Democrats voting for him up there.

Governor **Blanchard**. That's why he got 70-plus percent of the vote.

I want to concur with the earlier testimony of my distinguished colleagues, and ask that my statement be put in the record——

The **Chairman**. It will be so included.

Governor **Blanchard** [continuing]. So I can get to the point, and allow Governor Riley, who has really spent a career on this issue, to testify.

I can't think of anything that would be a better investment in the future of our country in preschool education than this legislation. I am convinced that the concerns of Senator Hatch—and I know his staff are still here—can be addressed. I would urge you not to create a straw man; not intimate that somehow the Federal Government will be too tough or, from the point of view of your bill, that somehow States can't be trusted. I think we can work these issues out.

This legislation, I believe, will provide for a better, more productive life for millions, of our people; a better, more literate work force which is going to be absolutely essential for jobs; and a better use of public dollars.

One reason I am here is because Ypsilanti, Michigan, is the site of the nationally acclaimed Perry Preschool project which was begun in 1962. Disadvantaged 3 and 4-year-olds were randomly assigned to a group that attended the Perry Preschool Program and to a group that did not. A follow-up survey at age 19 showed that the children in the Perry Preschool Program do better in school, are more employable, are more productive, are better citizens, and have a lower crime rate, than those who were not.

In education, for example, as the charts—and I think all of us who have studied preschool education understand, show more are literate; 61 percent versus 38. Fewer are school dropouts; 33 percent versus 51. More attend college or job training programs; 38 percent versus 21. Fewer are classified as developmentally delayed; 15 percent versus 35. In the world of work, more hold jobs; 50 percent versus 32.

And we are dealing with a core of seriously disadvantaged children. We're not dealing with an average situation here. In the community, fewer of these youngsters commit crimes and fewer are on welfare. Also, teenage women who participated in this project had a much lower birth rate, as well.

So I would concur with the Committee for Economic Development which stated, in 1985, I think what would be a universal consensus in America among educators, Democrats, Republicans, conservatives and liberals, and I quote, "It would be hard to imagine that a society could find a higher yield for a dollar investment than that found in preschool programs for its at-risk children."

Indeed, the Perry Project demonstrated that for every dollar invested in a one-year high quality program for at-risk children that that would yield about $6. That is a tremendous human investment.

But I think it is important to say that people who studied, reviewed and worked in this field believe that we're not just encouraging a comprehensive preschool program; we're talking about a good preschool program. One with developmentally appropriate curriculum and assessment procedures; one with teaching teams that are trained, seriously trained in early childhood development; one that has administrative support and curriculum leadership; classes with two adults and fewer than 20 children; and systematic efforts to involve parents in the community.

Those programs aren't cheap; they will require some Federal standard—absolutely. I don't think you want to waste your time and money to have a half-baked preschool program. I think that would be a disservice.

I might also say that while I am proud of the initiatives of States, including the one that we are launching in Michigan—an $80 million massive preschool program—in response to Senator Hatch, the real initiator on this one was Head Start. It was the Great Society. In fact, it may be the one program that people universally agreed worked, and everyone embraces, from all elements of the political spectrum.

So I would like to encourage you, suggest that the differences that some may have be worked out. I think the members of this committee are committed to the subject. We want to work with you in every way we can.

I am happy to answer any question you have. Everyone says, we all say it and we mean it, that our children are our future. I think it's time to give them an early smart start to that future.

[The prepared statement of Governor Blanchard follows:]

STATEMENT
OF
GOVERNOR JAMES J. BLANCHARD
STATE OF MICHIGAN

Senator Kennedy.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak today on one of our nation's most pressing investment needs -- quality education and child care for our at-risk preschool children.

We know from experience in Michigan that investment early in a child's formative years pays tremendous dividends in later years.

It provides an opportunity for better, more productive lives.

It results in a better, more literate workforce.

It is clearly a better use of public dollars.

How do we know this?

Through our nationally acclaimed Perry Preschool project in Ypsilanti, Michigan that was begun in 1962.

Disadvantaged three and four-year-olds were randomly assigned either to a group that attended the Perry Preschool program or to a group that did not.

A follow-up on both groups at age 19 showed that children in the Perry Preschool program do better in school . . . are more employable . . . and are better members of the community.

In education:

- More are literate (61 percent versus 38 percent)
- Fewer are school dropouts (33 percent versus 51 percent)
- More attend college or job training programs (38 percent versus 21 percent)
- Fewer are classified as developmentally delayed (15 percent versus 35 percent)

In the world of work:

- More hold jobs (50 percent versus 32 percent)

In the community:

- Fewer commit crimes (31 percent versus 51 percent)
- Fewer are on welfare (18 percent versus 32 percent)

In addition to this evidence of the benefits of preschool . . . teenage women who participated in preschool had a lower birth rate than those who did not (64 children versus 117 children per 100 women).

As the Committee for Economic Development said in 1985:

"It would be hard to imagine that society could find a higher yield for a dollar investment than that found in preschool programs for its at-risk children."

The Perry Preschool project demonstrated that every dollar invested in a one-year high-quality program for at-risk children yielded six dollars.

That's a tremendous human investment dividend.

The Perry Preschool program results were achieved by good preschool programming:

-- Developmentally appropriate curriculum and assessment procedures.

-- Teaching teams that are trained in early childhood development and continue to receive such training.

-- Administrative support that includes curriculum leadership.

-- Classes with two adults and fewer than 20 children.

-- And systematic efforts to involve parents as partners in their children's education.

Programs like this are not cheap.

But the findings in Michigan highlight the fact that a good, well-funded preschool program with a high return on investment makes more economic sense than a poor quality inexpensive program with a low return.

Unfortunately, fewer than one poor child in three in America has the opportunity to attend a preschool program of any kind, let alone a quality preschool program.

In Michigan that ratio is one in two.

We have 30,000 four-year-olds in poverty.

Only 14,300 of them are being served by Head Start -- an excellent federally funded program.

We recognize this gap and decided to do something about it ourselves.

We have launched a massive $80 million program over the next three years -- modeled after the Perry Preschool program -- to cover every "at-risk" four-year-old in Michigan.

We have already committed $2 million in state dollars for the four-year-old at-risk program to begin September 1 -- the last month of our fiscal year.

I have asked the Legislature in my State of the State and budget messages this year to authorize $20 million for a four-year-old at-risk preschool program.

An additional $20 million will come from a $250 million Education Excellence Fund I have proposed to set up by closing tax loopholes.

We hope to add $20 million more each year over the following two years to build the program to $80 million by 1991 and to expand it to include at-risk three-year-olds.

We in Michigan firmly believe that the most productive human investment we can make is at the preschool level.

In Michigan we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars in the largest prison construction program in our state's history.

By 1990 we will have built 20 new permanent prisons and doubled the capacity of our prison system in just six years.

I'm convinced that a good preschool program would have made that prison construction program unnecessary.

Senator Kennedy, we applaud you for your bill.

And your colleagues who also have recognized the tremendous need for preschool programs and the payoffs of such programs.

Four-year-olds have nobody lobbying for them in Washington or in Lansing.

That's why I am here today to speak for them and in favor of your bill.

Your bill is a good first step toward addressing a major national problem.

Preschool is a costly initial investment and states need help.

While I am committed to an $80 million state program in Michigan I also know that $80 million is not enough.

Families not eligible for Head Start need help.

And families need quality child care that spans working hours year round.

Your proposal does both.

It also allows a sliding fee scale so that all working families may benefit.

That's a needed feature that recognizes the changing family structure.

Your proposal will stretch our scarce state dollars and enable more children and families to be served.

It is also a compliment to Michigan and the Perry Preschool program that their standards of quality are adopted in your proposal.

I am particularly pleased that you emphasize child-initiated learning and parental and family involvement.

Studies have repeatedly shown the direct relationship between parental involvement and a child's achievement.

Your proposal is good -- but it could do even more.

I would encourage you to also address broader child care needs for children younger than four and to look at other possible service delivery systems -- such as family day care homes -- for younger at-risk children.

The majority of child care is currently provided nationally in day care homes.

We in Michigan are ready to work with you and your colleagues in both houses to help ensure a quality national child care program.

Your bill is an admirable complement to other legislative initiatives such as the Act for Better Child Care.

Such initiatives -- when coordinated -- will provide a basis for our national child care policy and put us on equal footing with other industrialized nations.

This makes good human development sense and good economic sense for our country.

Our children are our future.

We must begin now to give our nation's future an early, smart start.

The **Chairman**. Thank you very much, Governor. I understand you said that you would veto any appropriations bill that comes to your desk that doesn't include the early childhood intervention program; is that correct?

Governor **Blanchard**. I did. Some of the obstacles that you will have which are understandable but not justified, are elements in the education community that won't support a major, new initiative in preschool until they receive what they feel are an adequate sum of dollars for their programs.

In Michigan we increased state aid to K-12 education, Mr. Chairman, by 74 percent per pupil during my term and, yet, the lobbyists in the capital felt that wasn't enough, that we needed more—and I could appreciate that because I think we do. But until they had their rightful sum of dollars, they weren't going to support a new initiative in preschool.

What we found—and I think the case is somewhat different here in Washington—what we found is there is no real organized lobby for 3- and 4-year-olds. There is an organized lobby for K through 12, there is an organized lobby for private schools, there's an organized lobby for community colleges and for colleges and universities, and for voc ed, adult ed—you name it, special ed—all worthwhile areas of our investment. Areas in which you have invested your time since 1962 when you began your career as a United States Senator. Let me repeat. There isn't any effective organized lobby for 3- and 4-year-olds.

We are going to have to be that lobby, you and me, the people here on this committee, advocates who have been around for many years, long before I was a Governor of Michigan or a Congressman in my earlier years. You and I, Senator Hatch, Senators Thurmond, Mikulski, Metzenbaum and the staffing you have here, and people in this town who care about this issue. We are going to have to be the lobby, and it will be tough battle to establish this program in the meaningful, comprehensive way that I know you wish to do.

The **Chairman**. That's an excellent comment. We are very grateful to you for changing around your schedule and for your very strong and vigorous support for this effort. We thank you very much and will look forward to keeping in touch with you as we work on this program.

Senator **Thurmond**. Governor Blanchard, we're glad to have you with us.

Governor **Blanchard**. Thank you, Senator.

The **Chairman**. Thank you very much.

The final witness is Governor Richard Riley, the former Governor of South Carolina, which was among the first states to enact an education reform package that emphasized the needs of young children. I understand that the child development programs funded under the Education Improvement Act have been running for several years with very positive results.

We have used the South Carolina model as one of our examples for developing the Smart Start, and we want to thank Governor Riley very much for his presence here today, and for his patience in sticking with us through the course of the afternoon.

Governor, we're very glad to have you. It's good to know of your strong work in the Governors Association for expectant mothers who come from poor conditions. We have been able to enact a number of your recommendations that the Southern Governors made to us a number of years ago in terms of the intervention for expectant mothers.

We are always glad to have you back. The committee looks forward to hearing you.

We recognize the Senator from South Carolina.

Senator THURMOND. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the committee is having a hearing today on State Initiatives in Early Childhood Development programs. State initiatives in this area are highly commendable, and this hearing provides an excellent opportunity for other States to benefit from learning from the activities being developed by the States represented here today.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to welcome Former Governor Richard Riley from South Carolina. Governor Riley led the effort to enact an education reform bill that included several programs for young children.

Governor Riley, we are glad to have you here today, and I am confident that other members of the committee will benefit from what you have to say about these initiatives.

Mr. Chairman, while my schedule may not permit me to stay for the entire hearing, I look forward to studying the testimony of the witnesses today.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Governor Riley.

STATEMENT OF HON. RICHARD W. RILEY, FORMER GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Governor RILEY. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Thurmond, it's a great pleasure to be with you, as always.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, much of public life has been spent in this effort of attempting to improve the access and quality of education for the children of our State. South Carolina has a large portion of our population that was not blessed with having a quality education; oftentimes not at their fault, but part of history. We, in our State, are trying to rectify that and to say to you that I don't think any State in this Nation can say that they are ahead of South Carolina in terms of providing quality education now for all children.

When I was first elected Governor, I felt that for our particular point in history, if there was anything we should emphasize in our State, it was early childhood development in education. The theme of my first inaugural address was that we might can't be first in the public schools, as we had too far to go, but we were going to be first in the first grade and go from there.

I think we have made some progress. I am very proud of that. I think it's very relevant to this country that this committee and the Congress is interested in this business of early childhood development in education.

Now, I am very interested in the legislation—Senator, your legislation, the other measures that have been presented and are being considered. But the main thing is the fact that it is focusing—that your committee is focusing in on this business of children. Preschool is where I think the focus should be. This business of emphasizing 4-year-olds, I think, clearly, has every good aspect of public decisionmaking. It's long term. It has long-term benefits. It is prevention, as has been eloquently said by my predecessors here today.

There's a human side, of course, because any child who starts out behind generally stays behind for life. I think we see that. We've seen it time and time again. It's simply not fair. In this country, in this particular time, in this information society and economy, it's not fair for a young child to start out behind and stay behind the rest of their lives. Also, this aspect that deals with working parents, as far as good day care for their children, certainly is very appropriate for the times.

You may wonder why I became so interested in early child programs, but in our State the at-risk children who were not reaching their full potential certainly had to be reached. But we then started programs out, looking through pilot programs, and we found this out. For example, we found out that almost 40 percent of all low income children, without any preschool failed first grade—40 percent. This confirmed our hunch that many children who start behind stay behind.

After having a 4-year-old program—we started with a pilot program and now we have moved into a full state program, and a good kindergarten program, that 40 percent falls to about 12 percent. That is a significant drop. That is a kid who failed the first grade. If you figure the benefit of that alone, just the difference of those children passing the first grade, that cost, in 20 to 25 percent, pays for what this particular bill would cost.

Then in the EIA, the comprehensive education bill that we passed in 1984 that really projected us, I think, into the forefront of quality education, we have a phased-in program dealing with one-half day, 4-year-olds in high-risk areas. Next year, approximately 10,000 4-year-olds will be served in the schools in South Carolina. The State will provide $12 million for the teachers and teacher aides in a one-to-eleven adult-to-child ratio, provide supplies and materials. Local school districts provide all the overhead, the administrative and the building costs.

You may be interested in how the programs have been received. They have been received in a very positive way. They are totally voluntary from school district to school district. All but a handful of our districts will be participating in the programs in 1988 and 1989, only 4 years after we started the program.

We estimate that we will be reaching 60 to 70 percent of at-risk 4-year-olds in South Carolina. Of course, again, this is just a half-day program. Now, why is it a half-day program? Simply because that's all we can afford. Obviously, the whole-day program would be much more strong.

In the proposed legislation that I have reviewed the matching between State and Federal funds, along with the sliding fee scale for those who can afford to pay, is very appealing to me. This financing plan would allow States like South Carolina to serve many more children and to serve them more adequately.

I would encourage you to carefully look at the local contributions and I would love to see them be counted as part of the State match, where you do have a State program, Senator, under your proposal.

Let me comment just a little more about the proposed legislation. Several people have talked about flexibility; I won't go back into that. I do think that is extremely important. The idea of having one adult to 10 or 11 children is important in terms of quality. But your bill, as I read it, points out that you can have one certified early childhood teacher and one paraprofessional or teacher's aide for 20 to 22 children and I think, for this age children, adequately handle the program. Of course, that is very cost-effective.

I think the parent involvement is the key to the whole thing. You've got to have, in these 4-year-old programs, to pull in the parents, work with the parents, to help educate them to being good parents right along with the children.

This idea of coordinating the health and the social agencies is also extremely important. I would hope that perhaps you can build incentives into the program that would cause the regions to be more inclined toward parent involvement programs and to the coordination of services with the social service agencies and the health service agencies, along with the education agencies.

I think the need for early childhood development in education and health are simply very, very great in this country. I am extremely pleased to see this committee and other members of the Senate interested in it.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be happy to respond to questions.

[The prepared statement of Governor Riley follows:]

Richard W. Riley's Testimony
on Legislation to Encourage States to Create a Program of Education and Day Care Available to All 4-Year Olds

February 23, 1988

First, let me thank you for giving policymakers at the national level an opportunity to make a decision on an issue which has tremendous potential for the economical, educational and social well-being of the United States. As a governor for eight years and previous to that a legislator for a number of years, I saw how policymakers are whip-lashed from one crisis to another. These same type of crises force budgets to rise and fall. Often the long-term costs-benefit of legislation and budget decisions become lost in the heat of the moment.

Much of my public life has been spent on attempting to improve the access and the quality of education for the children of South Carolina. To me this has a clear relevance to our people, their past and their future. But, in order to participate in a school system of higher standards and higher expectations, a child who is entering the system must have a fair start. This means that the child's health and early development are relevant to improving our schools and their effectiveness. It means that a low birth weight infant born without decent medical case for its immature teenage mother doesn't have a fair start. Such an infant probably won't make it in the competitive life they face in our knowledge-based information economy.

The issue before you today deserves careful attention away from the crises of the moment, because the old adage "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure" applies in this situation. Sound development and day care programs for four year olds potentially can save hundreds upon hundreds of millions of dollars in later prisons, welfare, unemployment and social costs.

The prevention of these later costs will require an investment now in prevention, in good early childhood programs for four year olds.

Equally important to the long-term savings accrued by making our citizens more productive is the human side, the personal side. So many children enter school far behind their peers because they don't have the resources at home to have a stimulating environment. Many children sit in day care situations for hours with little activity or opportunity to explore or learn. What a tragedy to have young, eager minds locked out of learning at such a critical age. As a result, many of these precious young people start behind and stay behind through school...through life. As a nation, we can't afford the economic drain of this lost potential. As a nation built on fairness, we can't allow these young people to be left behind before they start.

Not only is the economic return solid in investing in good early childhood programs from the child's perspective, but an added benefit is gained by assisting the child's parent to be more productive. The demand for good day care far exceeds the availability of good day care. The net effect of this situation is that working parents spend countless hours worrying and working to patch together adequate care for their preschoolers. Having available quality early childhood programs for four-year-olds will reduce substantially the disruptions in working parents' lives making them more productive, too. Other parents can't afford child care, but want to work. This program will assist them as well.

You may wonder why I became so interested in early childhood programs as a governor. You see I come from a state with hundreds of thousands of wonderful children and families, but many are at-risk of not reaching their full potential or in some cases not being productive at all. A history of low-education and low-incomes preceded my governorship. We explored every angle to try to determine how to break the poverty cycle. A few facts gave us clues on where to begin.

For instance, we found that almost 40 percent of all low-income children without any preschool failed first grade. This confirmed our hunch that many children who start behind are likely to stay behind. On the other hand, we found that children who had participated in pilot-programs for four-year olds and attended kindergarten failed first grade at a much lower rate (about 12%). The failure rate of low-income children without any preschool was almost three to four times higher than those with a four-year old program and kindergarten.

Think of the human side of being able to avoid such early failure. And think of the cost of having these first graders repeat first grade. "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure."

As a result of this and other evidence and advice, in 1984 we in South Carolina launched a statewide half-day child development program in schools for at-risk four-year olds. The child development program was part of our comprehensive South Carolina Education Improvement Act. The program is being phased-in over a 5-6 year period to allow schools to prepare adequately for such developmental programs.

Next year approximately 10,000 four-year olds will be served in the schools. The state will provide about $12,000,000 for the teachers and teachers aides in a 11 to 1 adult-child ratio, and provide the supplies and materials. Local school districts provide all the overhead, administrative and building costs.

You may be interested in how the programs have been received in South Carolina. The participation by the parents and school districts is totally voluntary, so the numbers will tell you about our success. All, but a handful of our districts, will be participating in the program in 1988-89, four years after we started the program. We estimate that we will be reaching 60-70 percent of the at-risk four-year olds. From the level of voluntary participation you can tell the program is a success. Other evidence of success is indicated by the fact that more of our children are meeting the readiness standards for entering first grade and fewer need remedial help in the first grade.

You probably wonder why we only have a half-day program for at-risk children. That is all we can afford on our own. Likewise, with our limited resources, we focused on at-risk four-year olds.

In the proposed legislation, the matching concept between state and federal funds along with a sliding fee scale for those who can afford to pay is appealing. This financing plan would allow states like South Carolina to serve many more children and serve them more adequately. I would encourage you to allow the local contribution to be counted as part of the state match. As I mentioned earlier the overhead, administrative, heat, light and building costs in South Carolina's four-year old program are paid for by local districts and would be important to include as part of the state match.

Let me comment a little bit more about the proposed legislation. I think the legislation sets out a very worthwhile quality program. Considering the low-wealth of some states and high percentage of families in poverty in some of the same states, I would encourage you to protect the essential quality features, but also allow some flexibility in a few areas. The ideal should be to preserve quality, but allow cost savings. Otherwise, you might find that some states and schools with the greatest need for the four-year old program may not be able to participate.

Therefore, you might want to consider some flexibility in your legislation in several areas:

1. You may want to allow a 10 or 11 to 1 adult child ratio with one of the adults being a certified early childhood teacher and the other a trained paraprofessional.
2. For four-year olds, the majority of time in an all-day program will be involved in free play, rest, snacks and so forth. Although fully trained personnel need to be in leadership positions all of the day, I don't think you need a fully certified teacher in such a low child-adult ratio during such times as free play, rest and snacks. This flexibility would save millions of dollars and not jeopardize the overall quality of the program.

All education programs need to work harder in more fully utilizing the help and interest of parents and resources of other agencies. In early childhood development programs, the need for parent involvement and coordination with health and social agencies is even greater than in regular school programs.

Recipients of funds from this legislation should work hard in these two areas:

1. Gaining more parent involvement and participation with their own child's development and in the program itself and
2. Working with and coordinating services with health and social agencies to assure that the health and social needs of the children are addressed.

However, I urge you not to make such requirements too cumbersome and allow a state to substitute a reasonable alternative to federal requirements in this area. Sometimes "honey" is more effective than a "stick or vinegar." Therefore, you may need to encourage an extensive parent involvement component and close working relationships with health and social agencies by awarding a portion of the funds from this legislation to go to schools specifically as an incentive for these purposes.

The needs in early childhood development, education and health are massive. Starting with a nationwide collaborative approach with one-age group, namely four-year olds, makes sense. I urge you to endorse this legislation and provide the funding for the federal share of the match.

The **Chairman**. Thank you very much, Governor.

How did you decide, initially, to involve 4-year-olds? What was your motivation, or why did you think that was important?

Governor **Riley**. Well, of course, the Ypsilanti study was really one of the first longitudinal studies that we had and it was, I think, a 20-year study. It very clearly shows, in terms of dropouts, in terms of prison records, in terms of employment, as I recall, is something like 50 percent. Kids who went through without early childhood education and development programs and those who went through with them had about a 50 percent better shot. That was very meaningful to us.

We, in South Carolina, had lots of poor children that we had to work with, at-risk kids. We felt like that to build for the future, that the best thing for us to do was to get these young people when their minds are really being developed. If they are going to be sharp in a tough, competitive school system, in a tough, competitive world, you simply couldn't start in the seventh and eighth grade and get it done. You had to start early. We decided that to start early is absolutely the right thing to do.

The **Chairman**. And you are satisfied that those lessons from that study have application and have had application in terms of South Carolina?

Governor **Riley**. I am so satisfied, it's almost frightening. It works so well it's almost frightening.

The **Chairman**. Then why should the Federal Government then be involved whatsoever? Why not just let the States do it themselves?

Governor **Riley**. Well, again, you get into—I do strongly believe that States should be the primary force for education in this country. However, I also think that it's the prerogative of the Federal Government to attack central issues in this United States of America. And in this business of education, anyone who thinks that the proper focus for America today is not on the young people, the at-risk children, the bright children, the not-so-bright, that's where the focus has to be.

I think there's a place for the Federal Government to be involved in making that focus, and yet leaving the operation of the schools, the free flow of decision-making on the local and State school level.

The **Chairman**. I gather what you are talking about is really our future, our future economically, our ability to compete internationally. We are really investing in our future, and we are talking about a program that, by examination and by study and by experience, is a proven winner. What I am hearing you say is, "We can't waste another young mind in our country, and we shouldn't."

Governor **Riley**. Absolutely. It's not only a winner. As I perceive it, it's mandated upon those of us who have any responsible public decision-making at this time to focus in on the children of this Nation.

The **Chairman**. That is excellent.

Senator Thurmond.

Senator **Thurmond**. Again, Governor, we're glad to have you.

Governor **Riley**. Thank you, Senator.

Senator **Thurmond**. I wanted to ask you this. Would you construe this to be mainly legislation by the Federal Government to encourage the States, or for the Federal Government to put money into it?

Governor RILEY. Well, when you have the matching program, certainly it is an incentive to encourage States to get into a sound 4-year-old program. It is optional. It leaves it up to the States. Our State has already exercised that option; however, I would say we are funding it probably 25 percent to the level that we would like to be funding it.

So I see it as a mixed thing, Senator; that it is an incentive program. It is a focus for the country. And then it says that we're going to put the power of the United States into this business of saying to 4-year-olds, "We're interested and concerned about you," and then the States have to take the ball and run with it. So I think it's both.

Senator THURMOND. Does our State get any money for this purpose now?

Governor RILEY. We, of course, get Head Start. We have a very sound, active Head Start Program, as you well know, and it works very, very well.

Senator THURMOND. I mean is this a new program besides Head Start, or is this just an extension of Head Start?

Governor RILEY. Well, the program we have in South Carolina is a State program, deals only in very high-risk areas for 4-year-olds, half-day. So it is a very limited program that is kind of scratching the surface of what this committee's measures——

Senator THURMOND. Is the Federal Government putting money into that program?

Governor RILEY. No, sir. No, sir. That is purely State dollars and local dollars. It's the local government—the local school district provides the building, the administrative, the lighting, heating and so forth, and the State pays for the teacher and the program, and so forth.

Senator THURMOND. So this would be a new program in which the Federal Government would put money into?

Governor RILEY. Yes, sir, as I understand it.

Senator THURMOND. And you favor that?

Governor RILEY. I favor—the way the program is designed, as a matching basis, it has a great appeal to me. I do think it is a proper focus for this country.

Senator THURMOND. Of course, you understand the deficit we have now, about $3 billion?

Governor RILEY. Yes, sir. I would say this, Senator—no question about that, and those are matters, of course, that you all have to deal with, and I am fully aware and sensitive to that—if there is any cost-effective dollar that this Senate could direct into the use in this country, I think this is an area that it would bring back tenfold for whatever is invested into it.

I don't think there's any question about that in terms of prisons, in terms of welfare, in terms of unemployment, all of the other aspects of it. I do think it is very, very cost-effective.

Senator THURMOND. And then we've got to consider, too—I remember Sam Rayburn wrote me a letter years ago, when he was living, about Federal aid to education. He said that Federal control follows Federal aid.

Well, we certainly don't want the Federal Government controlling the schools. I think we've got to be very careful about that.

Governor RILEY. I think so, too. And as I understand, this bill is intended to let the support go into the State system, taking advantage of those programs that are there, those State programs that are there.

Senator THURMOND. Thank you very much.

Governor RILEY. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Governor, as an experienced governor, one that has been active in the Association, is it your belief that as we work out a partnership between the Federal Government and the States—certainly, that's what we're interested in—a joint program, with the Federal Government and the State sharing the particular—well, the financial burden, that this might be a way in which we may effectively, in a positive and constructive way, interest some of the States in developing, fashioning and shaping a program of this nature which, in your experience, has been really successful. Do you find that that would be useful?

Governor RILEY. Yes, sir. I certainly do think that is a very positive thing, not only from the State level; but as I read the legislation where a State is not involved, on the local level. And it does give the opportunity for a local school district, then, to get into it.

The CHAIRMAN. So in this sense, it would really be a constructive initiative—as you well understand, there's nothing that is going to require any State to involve itself.

Governor RILEY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no requirement for any State to participate. So it will be, basically, as you understand, a completely voluntary program. But I imagine if a State has a sense that they can leverage their funds and get the effect of $2 for a one dollar investment, that that might be of interest to that State.

And the benefit that will come will clearly be not only to that child, but to the country as a whole. And we will benefit not only by the dollars and cents that these children, as future contributing members of society can pay in taxes—and by the children's added self-value and self-worth—but also by increasing our Nation's competitiveness internationally.

Governor RILEY. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to thank you very much——

Senator THURMOND. Let me ask one more question, please, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Senator from South Carolina.

Senator THURMOND. There's nobody in the world any more interested in education than I am. I was a school teacher, athletic coach and a school superintendent. And during the 5 years I was in the State Senate, most of the legislation I introduced was on schools, to promote schools.

I am just wondering, why can't the States do this?

Governor RILEY. Well, our State is doing as much of it as we can. I don't have to tell you, Senator, how expensive, of course, education is and how important it is. The Federal Government has taken a great portion of the tax base of this country. We in the States, of course, are doing the best we can.

As you know, in South Carolina, we decided to put a penny sales tax on top of our regular education program, and the people supported that. The little people supported it, the poor people supported it, because they see that it is the only chance they have in the future. Part of that penny goes to this program here.

It breaks my heart to think that it is only a half-day program and it is only taken advantage of simply by the virtue of the size and the dollars by just a portion of our population. So I think the States can, I think various school districts—some have more money than others, but in terms of a national priority-setting, with the States maintaining their control of their educational systems, it seems to me that it makes pretty good sense to place Federal Dollars into what should be a national priority.

Senator THURMOND. I am just concerned—I am in favor of the programs helping these children—there's nothing more important. But I am concerned about plunging the Federal Government into another program. I have been up here 34 years, and every year, nearly, people come up with new programs, they plunge the Federal Government into them, and that's one reason we have a $3 billion debt.

Under the Constitution, education is primarily the responsibility of the States, as I see it, and the States ought to meet those responsibilities. States ought not to shirk those responsibilities. And simply because a State does shirk that responsibility, under the Constitution, is no reason for the Federal Government to assume some responsibility that belongs to the States. So I just pass that thought onto you.

Governor RILEY. Well, as I say, I share your view that education is a prerogative of the States. But I think if there is going to be a reason for a Federal Government, and if education is the great need in this country, and if early childhood is the place to go in building this country as a more competitive, more viable Nation, then it seems to me that, certainly, it is a proper role for the Federal Government to emphasize this priority; leaving control within the States, leaving the States with their power and authority to handle education.

Senator THURMOND. Can you leave control? Just like Sam Rayburn says, "Federal control follows Federal funds," and that has been the history—Federal control follows Federal funds. I don't ever want to see the Federal Government get control of education. If so, we can have a dictator to arise in this country. I want to see the States meet their responsibilities. They ought to meet them—and do their very best for education.

I think this is the number one priority in the States, education, and I commend you for what you did along the education lines in our State. But I am deeply concerned about plunging the Federal Government into new programs that could lead to Federal control—and to grant money that we don't have. There's not a State in this Nation that is not better off than the Federal Government, from a financial standpoint—not a state.

Governor RILEY. I won't argue with you about that.

Senator THURMOND. Every State is better off than the Federal Government. Where are we going to get this money? If you are going into a new program, were are you going to get the money?

Governor RILEY. Well, I don't know, Senator, and that is, fortunately, not my charge. But I would say this——

Senator THURMOND. You have asked us for more money; now tell us where to get it.

Governor RILEY. Well, I would say this. I don't think we can blame the Federal deficit on the 4-year-olds of America.

Senator THURMOND. Why, of course not; of course not.

That's all. Thank you. We are glad to have you here.

Governor RILEY. Thank you, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Governor, I just want to put in the record that last year we authorized, in the Elementary and Secondary Education Bill, $90 billion over the next 5 years, and it carried 97 to one. in the Senate of the United States, including the vote of my good friend from South Carolina. And it passed by over 400 votes in the House of Representatives, Republicans and Democrats alike. The President of the United States has even indicated that he wanted to increase federal spending for education.

Senator THURMOND. I believe that involved national security also in there.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee stands in recess.

[Whereupon, at 4:10 p.m., the committee recessed at the call of the chair.]

SMART START: THE COMMUNITY COLLABORATIVE FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1988

WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 1988

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES,
Washington, DC.

The committee convened, pursuant to notice, at 10:02 a.m., in room SD-430, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Edward M. Kennedy (Chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Kennedy, Simon, and Pell.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR KENNEDY

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will come to order.

We have a very full agenda here this morning, and we are having the debate on the Defense Authorization Bill on the Senate floor. I hope we will have as few interruptions as possible, but we want to mention that to the witnesses at the outset.

We have some extremely important testimony, and we want to include all of it as part of the record, but we will try to move along as rapidly as time permits.

I am very pleased to have the opportunity to hear from our distinguished group of witnesses this morning. The subject of this hearing is S. 2270, the Smart Start legislation which I introduced last month.

This is the second in a series of hearings on the legislation. Smart Start would make early childhood development programs universally available to the Nation's four-year-old children. Today, we'll hear about the very positive benefits that such programs provide and the differences such programs can make in children's lives, both in the short term, during their academic careers, and in the longterm, through adulthood, when they will be called upon to be contributing members of society—as taxpayers, as participants in the democratic process, and as parents themselves.

Another goal of the program is to help meet the child care needs of the growing number of working parents, by requiring that programs run for the full work day and full calendar year.

While Smart Start will not solve all of the Nation's child care problems, it will make a substantial contribution, and importantly, it will work well with comprehensive child care legislation now under consideration by this Committee.

I am a strong supporter of the Act for Better Child Care, S. 1885, which would expand the availability of licensed day care for children from infancy through adolescence. Smart Start would provide full-day early childhood development programs to children at an age when they can benefit greatly from a developmental program.

Indeed we will hear today and at future hearings that the benefits of early childhood education are overwhelming, that every dollar spent on such programs yields six dollars in taxpayer benefits, that children who are enriched by such programs do better in school and go on to lead productive lives much more often than their counterparts who do not receive developmentally appropriate preschool.

Smart Start would provide funds to supplement and strengthen existing early childhood programs, or to establish new programs where they don't currently exist. The bill allows States and localities the maximum flexibility in deciding what agencies will administer the program and who will be service providers.

This flexibility allows States to build on existing efforts, rather than forcing them to adhere to a Federal model. Thus the program can take many forms. For example, funds can be used to supplement existing high-quality half-day programs like Head Start so that they run all day, or upgrade existing full-day child care programs to improve salaries of staff, provide training in early childhood education, and institute a developmentally appropriate curriculum.

Smart Start would not duplicate the high-quality programs that already exist—indeed, it would make them more widely available. Because States are required to match Federal funds dollar for dollar, Smart Start would leverage State funds that are generally not now provided to Head Start and other such programs.

In addition, to further avoid duplication of services, this bill requires interagency policy boards at the State and local levels so that all future decisions about spending of early childhood funds are made by the education, Head Start, and child care communities together.

This spirit of community and cooperation, which is the basis of this legislation, is reflected in the diverse witnesses who have joined us here today. In their various capacities as Government officials, business leaders, educators, advocates,-they know the value of investing in our children—and the price we will pay if we do not.

I am pleased that these distinguished individuals are able to bring us their ideas on these important issues.

I am pleased to welcome our first witness, Evelyn Murphy, Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts. I am very glad that Evelyn could join us today and tell us about the impressive efforts that Massachusetts has made under her and Governor Dukakis' leadership in the area of early childhood education and child care. I am also proud to note that Massachusetts program has provided important models for other States and for the Smart Start legislation.

We are extremely grateful to Evelyn Murphy for joining us here this morning. She has been a leader in the area of concern for children in our Commonwealth for a number of years and has been a real inspiration in fashioning and shaping a number of the programs in our Commonwealth that have reached out and improved the quality of life for the children of Massachusetts.

We are delighted to welcome you here to our meeting this morning.

STATEMENT OF HON. EVELYN MURPHY, LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR OF MASSACHUSETTS

Ms. Murphy. Thank you, Senator Kennedy, very much.

I appreciate the opportunity to come and testify before you this morning and to share some of the experiences, as you suggested, of what Massachusetts has been doing. I also want to say to you that, clearly, your proposal on Smart Start is a shot in the arm for all of us. You are to be commended for what I think is a fine piece of drafting, and the sense of importance that early childhood development and care has for all of us. It is the emerging issue, and the way you have crafted this legislation is very appealing to all of us.

I could recite, as I have submitted formal testimony to you, the demographic trends that are going on in this country. They are becoming increasingly the conventional wisdom—more and more, two parents in the family are working and single parents are also working.

The data is increasingly being accepted. I think what has been missing and, what I would like to focus on today, is our understanding of that data. Our understanding is only becoming dimly apparent to us even now—in terms of what the trends mean for policies, what they mean in personal terms and in human terms of what is going on in this country.

So in the brief moments I have today, Senator, I would like to focus on what has been happening in Massachusetts, how we understand these trends and the Governor's Day Care Partnership Program, after spending three years of having a very low unemployment rate and seeing what can happen over the three years of this partnership.

Back in the mid-Eighties, 1984–1985, the Governor formed a Day Care Partnership in response to these trends, and we have over the past several years made some extraordinary investments at the State level. We have invested over $4.5 million in Head Start and another $10 million in early childhood education. We have 9,000 day care workers who have been trained. We have an increase of 49% in wages. These are issues that you have identified in your bill in terms of how to expand both the quality of early education programs and set some standards. We have experienced through these kinds of investments both a significant enhancement of the numbers of people who are now providing these kinds of programs and an expansion in the numbers of young people who are being provided some opportunities.

At this time, we now serve something like 14,000 preschool children in enhanced kindergarten programs; we are subsidizing child care for 29,000 children of low-income families and children from families in crisis; and we have seen a 20 percent increase in licensed child care, based on the kind of expansion fastened by our Partnership Program.

What we have seen from this is an understanding of the Massachusetts experience; that these trends are not going to change; that we are now looking at a tight labor market in our State from now until the end of the century. The demographics are fairly clear that, if in fact we are going to keep the Massachusetts experience and the economy going strong, we are going to need every working-age adult to be working and participating in the labor market, and that has direct bearing on the lack of time that these parents are going to have with their children.

We have also learned that these kinds of investments clearly pay off in terms of what happens for young people, their opportunities and, as we have seen from national studies, their improved performance as they go on through school.

Finally, I would say to you that we have learned that with all the investments we have made and we are proud of, we haven't begun to scratch the surface yet of what the demand is for early childhood development and care. I can talk to you about the numbers of companies in our State, some 155 companies that are now providing corporate child care—starting from 10, when I first was the Secretary of Economic Affairs, and moving to 155 quickly. It doesn't begin to tap the numbers of companies that could be providing child care in some form or another.

While we can cite the thousands and tens of thousands of young people who are being helped in low- and moderate-income families, it doesn't begin to tap the need yet.

So our learning from the Massachusetts experience is, first and foremost that partnerships work; that we have seen that these partnerships, as you have suggested in the bill, leverage some considerable investments by other institutions, by companies, by resources in the community.

I started a corporate child care program by pronouncing I was going to do this, and without any money from the State legislature, without the authorization, and with some jawboning of company presidents, produced 80 companies within the first couple of months that were interested in providing something called child care if we would just help them and give them the moral support and some advice about where to find some low-interest loans.

I would like to give you two examples here, because I think they illustrate quite vividly the kind of partnerships that you suggested in your legislation.

The first is the Merrimack River Day Care Center, which is a worksite center, primarily serving employees of Greico Brothers, a Lawrence clothing manufacturer. Troubled by the number of employees forced to quit because of child care problems, Greico Brothers' Senior Vice President initially contacted the Corporate Child Care Program which I started. Over the past three years, our community resource and referral agencies have helped Greico and other companies find out what kind of child care needs fit their employees and fit their companies and what the resources are in the community for responding to that.

In Greico Brothers' case, the local community resource and referral group worked with both management and the union representatives to design a center which now serves both toddlers and preschoolers.

The start-up funding for this program was provided by a low-interest loan through the Massachusetts Industrial Finance Agency, and a set-aside that we made in this quasi-public State agency for giving such a low-interest loan, and through a union vote. The union members of Greico Brothers set aside a penny an hour on their wages as their contribution. Seeing that some of the younger members of the staff and employees did not want to have to compromise and really wanted some child care, the older members of the union went along with us and provided what we thought was an extraordinary vote.

Now parents pay on a sliding scale basis and most are subsidized through a contract with the center and the State Department of Social Services. That child care program is one model—the Corporate Child Care site—employers, employees, the community, all working together.

The second model is the Boston public schools' Early Learning Center in Brighton. Housed in an elementary school, the Early Learning Center provides full day, year-round services for three classes of three- to five-year-olds and their families. It is a collaborative program designed by a local advisory council, including parents and teachers and day care providers, and the Boston public schools in collaboration with Boston University and with Wheelock College. The program is comprehensive in nature, combining early childhood education and child care.

Each day, the children receive breakfast, lunch and snacks at the center. The center's program for parents encourages parents to be involved with their children's education at school and at home. A parent room is available at the Early Learning Center where parents can meet with other parents and get information about child development, parenting, and about community resources. A social services coordinator provides linkages with agencies throughout Boston to assure available supports are accessible to both the families and the children. That is another model within the school system with the kind of local collaboration that you have suggested in your legislation.

Let me say in conclusion, Senator Kennedy, that based on what I see happening right now, if you give the States and the communities a foundation of a strong commitment from the Federal Government, which we have not had, to early childhood development and care, with the kind of standards as a backdrop like you are suggesting, and let us figure out how best to provide that care and use to the maximum extent possible economic conditions, the social need, the institutions and the capacity within the community, then that is the kind of Federal, State and local partnership that I think would spark enormous energy right now, based largely on the need that is out there which is, as I said, even with Massachusetts' enormous initiatives, still untapped.

We are really quite excited and challenged by what you are doing. We would encourage you. We can provide all kinds of data from our own models, as much as you and your staff need. But we think that this bill and the ABC bill—these are not exclusive, they are additive—the more we can add on to the child development and child care capacity in our communities throughout our State and throughout the country, the better we are going to be able to handle the long-term trends of what is happening with many parents throughout the country.

So I thank you for the opportunity to be here and look forward to working with you on the bill.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Murphy follows:]

TESTIMONY OF LT. GOVERNOR EVELYN MURPHY
BEFORE THE SENATE LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE
MAY 11, 1988

THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN, AND MEMBERS OF THE LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE, FOR GIVING ME THIS OPPORTUNITY TO TESTIFY BEFORE YOU TODAY. IN PARTICULAR, MR. CHAIRMAN, YOU ARE TO BE COMMENDED FOR YOUR LEADERSHIP IN SPONSORING THE SMART START BILL AND FOR CONDUCTING THESE HEARINGS. THE AVAILABILITY OF HIGH QUALITY EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION AND CHILD CARE IS A CRITICAL NEED FACING THIS COUNTRY. YOUR EFFORTS, AND THE EFFORTS OF THE LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE WILL HELP FOCUS NATIONAL ATTENTION TO ADDRESS THIS CRITICAL NEED.

HIGH QUALITY, EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS ARE INCREASINGLY VITAL TO THE HEALTH AND WELFARE OF OUR CHILDREN AS WELL AS THE VERY ECONOMIC FUTURE OF OUR NATION. WE KNOW FROM COUNTLESS STUDIES THAT THE YEARS BETWEEN BIRTH AND AGE FIVE ARE CRUCIAL IN EACH INDIVIDUAL'S DEVELOPMENT. AND WE ALSO KNOW THAT EFFECTIVE EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAMS, LIKE THE PERRY PRESCHOOL, LIKE THE EARLY EDUCATION PROJECT IN MY HOME TOWN OF BROOKLINE, CAN HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT IN IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF OUR CHILDREN'S LIVES AS WELL AS HELPING TO ENSURE THAT THEY BECOME PRODUCTIVE CITIZENS.

CHANGING DEMOGRAPHICS AND THE REALITIES OF A CHANGING WORKFORCE OVER THE LAST TWO DECADES HAVE DRAMATICALLY INCREASED THE NEED FOR CHILD CARE. TODAY, LESS THAN TEN PERCENT OF AMERICAN FAMILIES FIT THE STEREOTYPE OF A HOUSEHOLD MADE UP OF A WORKING FATHER AND A FULL-TIME HOMEMAKER MOTHER WHO CARES FOR THE CHILDREN AT HOME. IN FACT, WELL OVER HALF OF MARRIED WOMEN WITH CHILDREN UNDER SIX ARE NOW EMPLOYED. THESE WORKFORCE DYNAMICS ARE EXPECTED TO CONTINUE, INCREASING THE DEMAND FOR CHILD CARE PROGRAMS.

FURTHER, AN INCREASING NUMBER OF CHILDREN -- ABOUT 20% -- ARE GROWING UP IN SINGLE PARENT FAMILIES. IT IS ESTIMATED THAT MORE THAN HALF OF TODAY'S YOUNGSTERS WILL LIVE IN SINGLE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS BEFORE REACHING THE AGE OF EIGHTEEN. WITHOUT ADEQUATE DAY CARE, THESE FAMILIES MAY BE FORCED TO RELY ON PUBLIC ASSISTANCE.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION AND CHILD CARE REPRESENT NOT ONLY AN INVESTMENT IN THE PRESENT, BUT AN INVESTMENT IN THE FUTURE AS WELL. AS THE BABY BOOM AGES AND RETIRES, THERE WILL BE FEWER WORKERS TO TAKE THEIR PLACE. THESE DEMOGRAPHICS, AS WELL AS THE INCREASINGLY COMPLEX SOCIETY IN WHICH WE LIVE, ARGUE FOR AN INVESTMENT IN TODAY'S GENERATION TO ENSURE THAT EACH

YOUNG PERSON DEVELOPS TO HIS OR HER FULL POTENTIAL. THE ECONOMY OF THE TWENTY FIRST CENTURY WILL DEMAND A HIGHLY EDUCATED AND WELL TRAINED LABOR FORCE. NOW IS THE TIME TO LAY THE GROUNDWORK IF WE ARE TO ACHIEVE ALL THAT WE CAN AS A NATION AT THE TURN OF THE CENTURY.

THE CRITICAL NATURE OF EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS TO OUR FUTURE IS A THEME WHICH HAS CONSISTENTLY EMERGED FROM A POLICY PROJECT WHICH I INITIATED UPON BECOMING LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR -- MY BLUEPRINT 2000 PROJECT. THE PURPOSE OF MY INITIATIVE IS TO TAKE A LOOK AT THE FUTURE TRENDS FACING OUR STATE, AND TO PUT TOGETHER A PLAN TO HELP GUIDE THE COMMONWEALTH INTO THE TWENTY FIRST CENTURY.

ONE OF THE UNDERLYING TRENDS WHICH WE SEE IN THE YEARS AHEAD IS THAT THE NUMBER OF AVAILABLE JOBS IN MASSACHUSETTS WILL OUTPACE THE GROWTH RATE OF THE WORKFORCE. THIS POSES BOTH AN ENORMOUS OPPORTUNITY AND AN ENORMOUS CHALLENGE FOR THE FUTURE. ON THE ONE HAND, IT SUGGESTS THAT UNEMPLOYMENT IN MASSACHUSETTS WILL REMAIN LOW AND THAT WE WILL BE ABLE TO EXTEND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY TO THOUSANDS AND THOUSANDS OF OUR FELLOW CITIZENS WHO UP TO NOW HAVE NOT SHARED IN MASSACHUSETTS' ECONOMIC SUCCESS.

AT THE SAME TIME, HOWEVER, OUR ABILITY TO KEEP OUR ECONOMY STRONG RESTS ON OUR ABILITY TO GRADUATE EVERY YOUNG PERSON FROM HIGH SCHOOL. EVERY SCHOOL DROPOUT, EVERY CHILD LOST TO TEEN PREGNANCY, EVERY HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE WITHOUT BASIC LITERACY SKILLS, DIMINISHES BOTH THE ECONOMIC POTENTIAL OF THE INDIVIDUAL AS WELL AS THE ECONOMIC FUTURE OF OUR STATE.

THAT IS WHY THE SMART START BILL IS IMPORTANT. IF WE ARE TO MEET THE ECONOMIC CHALLENGES THAT LAY AHEAD, WE AS A SOCIETY MUST INVEST NOW IN EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS. THAT WILL CLEARLY REQUIRE A PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, A PARTNERSHIP WHICH INVOLVES EMPLOYERS, EDUCATORS, PARENTS, DAY CARE PROVIDERS, AND ADVOCATES AMONG OTHERS.

UNTIL NOW THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS NOT ALWAYS BEEN A WILLING PARTNER. THE SMART START BILL -- AS WELL AS THE ABC BILL -- IS AN IMPORTANT STEP IN DEFINING THE FEDERAL ROLE.

IN ADDITION TO THE FEDERAL COMMITMENT TO EARLY EDUCATION AND CHILD CARE, THE APPROACH INCORPORATED IN SMART START CONTAINS SEVERAL NOTEWORTHY FEATURES. FOR ONE, PROGRAMS FUNDED UNDER THE BILL WILL RUN FOR THE FULL WORK DAY AND THE FULL CALENDAR YEAR TO SERVE WORKING PARENTS' NEED FOR CHILD CARE.

MOREOVER, THE PROGRAMS FUNDED UNDER THE SMART START BILL WOULD PLACE EMPHASIS ON A DEVELOPMENTALLY APPROPRIATE CURRICULUM AND SET STANDARDS, SUCH AS THE STAFF-CHILD RATIO AND PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT, TO ENSURE THE PROVISION OF HIGH QUALITY EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS. THE LEGISLATION ALSO RECOGNIZES THE IMPORTANCE OF PROFESSIONAL TRAINING AS WELL AS SALARY UPGRADING TO ENSURE QUALITY CARE.

FINALLY, SMART START WOULD PROVIDE NEEDED FLEXIBILITY TO STATE GOVERNMENTS AND ENVISIONS A PARTNERSHIP AT THE STATE AND LOCAL LEVEL TO DECIDE THE BEST ALLOCATION OF SMART START DOLLARS.

I AM PROUD TO SAY, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT MASSACHUSETTS HAS BEEN A LEADER IN PROVIDING HIGH QUALITY CHILD CARE AND EARLY EDUCATION SERVICES. OUR MASSACHUSETTS DAY CARE PARTNERSHIP IS THE MOST COMPREHENSIVE OF ITS KIND IN THE NATION. KEY TO ITS SUCCESS HAS BEEN THE LEADERSHIP PROVIDED BY GOVERNOR DUKAKIS. OVER THE PAST FOUR YEARS WE HAVE INCREASED STATE SPENDING FOR DAY CARE BY MORE THAN 90%, AND THIS YEAR WE WILL SPEND OVER $130 MILLION ON CHILD CARE.

WE HAVE CREATED A PUBLIC/PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP, BRINGING TOGETHER ALL THE ACTORS WHO HAVE AN IMPORTANT STAKE IN THE AVAILABILITY OF HIGH QUALITY, AFFORDABLE CHILD CARE. THE PARTNERSHIP WAS INITIATED BY GOVERNOR DUKAKIS IN JANUARY OF 1985. IT IS A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH, DEVELOPED BY A FIFTY PERSON TASK FORCE COMPRISED OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS, BUSINESS AND LABOR LEADERS, SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS, COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS AND FACULTY, DAY CARE PROVIDERS, AND PARENTS. THE GOAL OF THE PARTNERSHIP IS TO ASSURE AVAILABLE, AFFORDABLE DAY CARE FOR EVERY MASSACHUSETTS WORKING FAMILY.

SEVENTEEN STATE AGENCIES, COORDINATED BY A DAY CARE POLICY UNIT IN OUR EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF HUMAN SERVICES, ARE INVOLVED IN MAKING THE PARTNERSHIP WORK. OUR ROLE IS TO:

* HELP COMMUNITIES IDENTIFY CHILD CARE NEEDS AND EXISTING GAPS IN SERVICES.

* PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND INCENTIVES TO DEVELOP NEW PROGRAMS AND EXPAND EXISTING PROGRAMS.

* DETERMINE QUALITY STANDARDS AND MONITOR THESE STANDARDS TO INSURE THAT CHILDREN'S DEVELOPMENTAL NEEDS ARE MET.

* SUBSIDIZE THE COSTS OF CARE FOR LOW AND MODERATE INCOME FAMILIES.

* PURCHASE CARE FOR FAMILIES IN CRISIS.

A NETWORK OF 12 CHILD CARE RESOURCE AND REFERRAL AGENCIES (CCR&R'S) WITH TWENTY OFFICES THROUGHOUT THE STATE PLAYS A CRITICAL ROLE IN IMPLEMENTING THE PARTNERSHIP PLAN. THESE CCR&R'S HAVE BECOME EACH COMMUNITY'S HUB OF CHILD CARE ACTIVITY. OVER 40,000 PARENTS HAVE RECEIVED ASSISTANCE IN FINDING CHILD CARE. AT THE SAME TIME, CCR&R'S IDENTIFY NEEDS AND BRING TOGETHER STATE AND LOCAL RESOURCES TO SUPPORT EXISTING PROGRAMS AND DEVELOP NEW ONES. THESE AGENCIES PROVIDE TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO BOTH TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF IN ORDER TO ENHANCE THE QUALITY OF EXISTING CHILD CARE SERVICES.

OF PARTICULAR RELEVANCE TO THE COMMITTEE AS IT DISCUSSES THE SMART START PROPOSAL ARE OUR SPECIFIC EFFORTS RELATED TO EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION. FOR ONE, MASSACHUSETTS MAKES A SIGNIFICANT INVESTMENT -- $4.5 MILLION THIS FISCAL YEAR -- IN OUR HEAD START PROGRAMS. IN ADDITION, AS PART OF A 1985 PUBLIC SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT ACT, WE HAVE AN EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAM PROVIDING MORE THAN $10 MILLION FOR EARLY EDUCATION PROGRAMS. SEVENTY FIVE PERCENT OF THESE FUNDS GO TO PROVIDING SERVICES TO LOW-INCOME CHILDREN. IN ORDER TO RECEIVE FUNDS, COMMUNITIES MUST FIRST COMPLETE A COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND ESTABLISH AN EARLY CHILDHOOD ADVISORY COUNCIL. THIS YEAR MORE THAN 14,000 CHILDREN WILL BE SERVED, PRIMARILY IN PRESCHOOL AND ENHANCED KINDERGARTEN PROGRAMS.

TO DATE, THE MASSACHUSETTS DAY CARE PARTNERSHIP HAS A VERY LONG LIST OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

* 8,800 ADDITIONAL CHILDREN IN SUBSIDIZED CHILD CARE, FOR A TOTAL OF 29,000 CHILDREN SERVED IN LOW-INCOME FAMILIES AND FAMILIES IN CRISIS.

* A 20% INCREASE IN LICENSED CHILD CARE, RESULTING IN ABOUT 117,000 AVAILABLE PLACES STATEWIDE.

* 79 NEWLY DEVELOPED CORPORATE CHILD CARE PROGRAMS BRINGING THE TOTAL TO 155 PRIVATE EMPLOYERS THROUGHOUT THE STATE THAT HAVE DEVELOPED CHILD CARE OPTIONS FOR THEIR EMPLOYEES.

* A $750,000 LOAN FUND ESTABLISHED BY THE MASSACHUSETTS INDUSTRIAL FINANCE AGENCY.

* 13 NEW PROGRAMS FOR 750 CHILDREN OF STATE EMPLOYEES, BRINGING THE TOTAL NUMBER OF DAY CARE CENTERS IN STATE-OWNED FACILITIES TO 46, SERVING ABOUT 1850 CHILDREN.

* A 40% INCREASE IN WAGES FOR DAY CARE WORKERS EMPLOYED IN PROGRAMS WITH STATE CONTRACTS, RAISING THE AVERAGE SALARY TO $17,500 A YEAR.

* 5,000 DAY CARE WORKERS TRAINED THROUGH COLLEGE-CREDIT COURSES OR STATE-SPONSORED WORKSHOPS.

HOWEVER, THESE ACCOMPLISHMENTS DO NOT PROVIDE THE TRUE FLAVOR OF THE DAY CARE PARTNERSHIP. I WANTED TO SHARE WITH YOU TODAY STORIES OF TWO MODEL PROGRAMS -- ONE OF WHICH I AM PARTICULARLY FAMILIAR WITH BECAUSE I HELPED TO GET IT STARTED WHEN I WAS THE HEAD OF OUR EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS (EOEA).

THE FIRST IS THE MERRIMACK RIVER DAY CARE CENTER, A WORK-SITE CENTER, PRIMARILY SERVING THE EMPLOYEES OF GREICO BROTHERS, A LAWRENCE CLOTHING MANUFACTURER. TROUBLED BY THE NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES FORCED TO QUIT BECAUSE OF CHILD CARE PROBLEMS, GREICO BROTHER'S SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT INITIALLY CONTACTED OUR CORPORATE CHILD CARE OFFICE, WHICH I ESTABLISHED AT EOEA, FOR HELP IN STARTING A WORK-SITE CENTER.

IN THE PAST THREE YEARS OUR CORPORATE CHILD CARE OFFICE -- WORKING CLOSELY WITH OUR NETWORK OF CHILD CARE RESOURCE AND REFERRAL AGENCIES -- HAS HELPED MASSACHUSETTS EMPLOYERS DETERMINE WHICH KIND OF CHILD CARE PROGRAM WOULD BEST MEET THE NEEDS OF THEIR EMPLOYEES.

IN GREICO BROTHER'S CASE, THE LOCAL CCR&R'S WORKED WITH BOTH MANAGEMENT AND UNION REPRESENTATIVES IN DESIGNING A CENTER WHICH NOW SERVES BOTH TODDLERS AND PRESCHOOLERS. START-UP FUNDING FOR THE PROGRAM WAS PROVIDED THROUGH A LOW INTEREST LOAN THROUGH THE MASSACHUSETTS INDUSTRIAL FINANCE AGENCY. THROUGH A UNION VOTE, EVERY GREICO BROTHER'S EMPLOYEE ALSO AGREED TO CONTRIBUTE A PENNY AN HOUR FOR ONE YEAR TO BUY MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES -- A CONTRIBUTION THEY HAVE CONTINUED IN ORDER TO DEVELOP A SCHOLARSHIP FUND. PARENTS PAY ON A SLIDING-FEE BASIS AND MOST ARE SUBSIDIZED THROUGH A CONTRACT THE CENTER HAS WITH THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES.

A SECOND MODEL PROGRAM IS THE BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOL'S EARLY LEARNING CENTER IN BRIGHTON. HOUSED IN AN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, THE EARLY LEARNING CENTER PROVIDES FULL DAY-YEAR ROUND SERVICES FOR THREE CLASSES OF 3 TO 5 YEAR OLD CHILDREN AND THEIR FAMILIES. IT IS A COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM DESIGNED BY A LOCAL ADVISORY COUNCIL -- INCLUDING PARENTS, TEACHERS, AND DAY CARE PROVIDERS -- AND THE BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN COLLABORATION WITH BOSTON UNIVERSITY AND WHEELOCK COLLEGE. THE PROGRAM IS COMPREHENSIVE IN NATURE, COMBINING EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION AND CHILD CARE.

EACH DAY, CHILDREN RECEIVE BREAKFAST, LUNCH, AND SNACKS AT THE CENTER. THE CENTER'S PROGRAM FOR PARENTS ENCOURAGES PARENTS TO BE INVOLVED IN THEIR CHILDREN'S EDUCATION AT SCHOOL AND AT HOME. A PARENT ROOM IS AVAILABLE AT THE EARLY LEARNING CENTER WHERE PARENTS CAN MEET WITH OTHER PARENTS AND GET INFORMATION ABOUT CHILD DEVELOPMENT, PARENTING, AND COMMUNITY RESOURCES. A SOCIAL SERVICES COORDINATOR PROVIDES LINKAGES WITH AGENCIES THROUGHOUT BOSTON TO INSURE THAT AVAILABLE SUPPORTS ARE ACCESSIBLE TO FAMILIES AND CHILDREN IN THE CENTER.

THESE ARE JUST TWO OF THE SCORES OF EXAMPLES OF OUR PARTNERSHIP PROJECT THROUGHOUT THE COMMONWEALTH. OUR GOAL IS TO CREATE HUNDREDS MORE OVER THE NEXT SEVERAL YEARS. EACH PROGRAM BRINGS TOGETHER UNIQUE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE RESOURCES IN ORDER TO CREATE A VIABLE PROGRAM.

DESPITE OUR ACCOMPLISHMENTS, THERE IS CLEARLY MUCH MORE WE HAVE TO DO. MASSACHUSETTS PARENTS STILL OFTEN CONFRONT WAITING LISTS OR PAY TOO MUCH OF THEIR INCOME FOR QUALITY CHILD CARE. STATES CANNOT SOLVE CHILD CARE NEEDS ALONE -- WE NEED FEDERAL HELP. THAT IS WHY YOUR SPONSORSHIP OF THE SMART START BILL -- AS WELL AS THE ABC BILL -- IS SO IMPORTANT.

I LOOK FORWARD TO WORKING WITH YOU TO ACHIEVE LEGISLATION WHICH WILL MAKE THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT A TRUE PARTNER WITH STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT, BUSINESS, LABOR, SCHOOLS, HIGHER EDUCATION, DAY CARE PROVIDERS, FOUNDATIONS, AND PARENTS IN MEETING THE NEEDS OF OUR FAMILIES AND CHILDREN. THERE IS NOT ANY MORE CRITICAL NEED THAN QUALITY EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS. WITH YOUR LEADERSHIP, AND THE LEADERSHIP OF MEMBERS OF THIS COMMITTEE, WE CAN ASSURE THAT TODAY'S PRESCHOOLERS WILL GROW TO THEIR FULL POTENTIAL.

THANK YOU AGAIN FOR GIVING ME THIS OPPORTUNITY TO TESTIFY BEFORE YOU TODAY. I WOULD BE HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS YOU MAY HAVE.

The **Chairman**. That is very helpful testimony, and I want to ask you about some specific areas.

One of the questions that has been raised in the context of several pieces of legislation is how we are going to link early childhood education, and the various support services found in Head Start. What has been the situation in Massachusetts? How have you been able to harmonize the various groups, such as educators, Head Start directors, and day care providers, that have been working in somewhat different areas, but really, obviously in a common endeavor to help young children? How have you been able to deal with that? Has this been a problem in Massachusetts?

Ms. **Murphy**. No, it is not really a problem because, as I said, the need is so enormous. There are two ways that we have dealt with that. One is that we have had these community-based resource and referral services set up in 14 different networks throughout the State, and these groups have pulled in the resources, have worked with whoever is out there—with the Head Start programs, with educational resources, with the Ys, with all of the agencies that have been involved in some way with child care before and pulled them in to respond to whatever the needs are in that place.

The other thing I found, and I found it quite vividly in talking with corporations, is that it is helpful if you are nonprescriptive to start with. I used to take that tack with the company presidents whom I'd ask in for lunch and say, "I don't care what you do if you'll provide some kind of child care." For some companies, that means onsite, and for some, if they are spread throughout the State, it means a voucher system, and for others it means just information and referral. If you let those companies or those institutions fit around their particular structure and the capacity at the time, then you'll find an enormous response. But it is meant not as prescribing from the State level down what is right or wrong; it is meant more how do we help you get through the licensing, how do we provide some seed money for loans and remodelling, and in a more helpful way, turn that relationship into more support than regulation. Then it produces enormous positive response.

I had promised the Governor that I would make ten more corporate child care programs companies available, when we were only citing four in 1983. People kept saying, "Oh, don't do ten, because if we only get nine, you'll be seen as a failure." I had 80 companies holding up their hands, wanting to do something, within a couple months, and then 155 within the next few years—all from being nonprescriptive about if you'll do something, we will help you.

The **Chairman**. So do you find that providing maximum flexibility at the State level is an appropriate way to structure the delivery of early childhood services?

Ms. **Murphy**. Yes. I think the wisdom of what you are proposing is that it has given some real flexibility to fit into the particular State and community needs.

The **Chairman**. You have a panel up there of some 50 members, as I understand from your testimony.

Ms. **Murphy**. Yes.

The **Chairman**. Isn't that somewhat unwieldy?

Ms. **Murphy**. Oh, not in Massachusetts, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we will go to the next question; we'll take your word for it. [Laughter.]

I think you obviously have been successful.

Let me ask you, is a 50-50 Federal-State financial partnership realistic? Do you think that this is workable in a State that is already providing some resources; do you see these Federal funds as a leveraging factor that can have exponential implications in terms of growth?

Ms. MURPHY. Yes, yes, I do. I think it is not an unreasonable requirement to have some matching and some serious money put into the pool from the State and locality, with the flexibility that you have offered we ought to be able to meet those matches. And as you decline that match over the years, it makes a lot of sense.

I am constantly struck with how we have looked at some of our quasi-public agencies as being able to make the matches and help support some child care in our communities as well as the social services agencies. We have had no trouble in finding that.

Now, understandably, that is a State with a strong economy and a 3 percent unemployment rate over many years. It seems to me that unless you do require some kind of matching funds, you will not get the level of commitment that is needed to get these things going.

The CHAIRMAN. Our legislation has an advisory panel both at the State level and at the local level. They have different responsibilities.

Ms. MURPHY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you think that would work? Would there be conflict between them? We try, obviously, at the State level initially to help identify areas of greatest need, and then hopefully, we will be able to have a nationwide program. We want the State to take some responsibility for the program, especially in meeting the basic standards. But the local level policy group, made up of the various groups, is going to be instrumental in identifying how those services might actually best be delivered.

Has this process worked reasonably well in Massachusetts, and what kind of problems do you face—let me ask you that—and then give me an assessment as to how you have been able to deal with them and overcome them.

Ms. MURPHY. It has worked very well, in large measure because at the State level and at the local level, people are overwhelmed by the needs that are still out there and yet to be addressed. So it is not a question of taking over somebody else's turf or carving up a limited pie. There is just an overwhelming demand for more child care and more early childhood development.

At local level, I was in Fitchburg the other day and found the Chamber of Commerce and a local hospital and a local educational institution suddenly sitting down and talking for the first time. They have all wanted to start some kind of child care program, and have all been doing it independently, even with our CCRTR out there. And they just discovered, lo and behold, that they were all talking about the same thing, but had not talked to each other even through Fitchburg, Massachusetts is a fairly small scale city.

So there is a level of cooperation and collaboration between State and local agencies and groups, given the demand.

The issue that we face is one of workers—good morning, Senator Simon——

The CHAIRMAN. We welcome Senator Simon to the hearing.

Senator SIMON. Thank you. I am happy to be here with you and your distinguished constituent from Massachusetts.

Ms. MURPHY. Thank you very much, Senator Simon.

What we have seen is a shortage of child care workers, and the real need here to both pay them better wages and continue the kind of training and support for a labor force which has been traditionally undervalued and underpaid.

So our real need is to continue to attract people into providing that kind of care, early childhood development skill and expertise, and that's one of the major limiting factors for us right now.

The CHAIRMAN. You understand the purpose of the advisory boards in Smart Start. I think the language is quite clear that we are not trying to replace any of those existing boards, panels, groups, task forces, that are in existence and working and functioning effectively in the States. That, I think, is important. I think we have addressed that in the legislation, and we'll find out whether others feel that that has been achieved.

So we are not interested, in replacing the structure and form which have been successful in this particular State. We want to maximize the resources that come through, the program to help children. I think that we have tried to build flexibility into the program so we can build on the efforts of States that are beginning to move in this area.

I want to thank you very much and recognize Senator Simon. You have been very helpful and very responsive to these questions, and if we have some others, we might send them to you for written response and have them made a part of the record.

Ms. MURPHY. I thank you.

Senator SIMON. If I can just—and I regret I was not here for your testimony—let me just say a word or two on the whole general subject.

I think this is an area where we just have to invest substantial sums of money, frankly, significant sums beyond what we are talking about here. We know from the tests in Ypsilanti, Michigan, and by New York University that where you have an intensive preschool education program, you have dramatic changes in the dropout rate, teenage pregnancy rate and the crime rate. We know it. It is not theory. And yet we are doing almost nothing about it.

And when you look at dropout rates in almost every urban center in this Nation, you know we are just wasting the most fundamental resource that we have. And I guess one of my concerns as I look at the future of this country is not only has this President changed the budget priorities, but he has changed the national mindset. Now, if we want to spend a few dollars for early childhood education, all of a sudden, we are labelled a big spender; but if we want to spend $36 billion for two new nuclear aircraft carrier flotilla, somehow that label never gets tossed our way.

We are going to have to do much, much more in this field of education, and preschool education, particularly in disadvantaged areas, simply has to be a major national priority. And I guess among others, I am lobbying Evelyn Murphy and Ted Kennedy, since they may have some influence with the next President of the United States on this. I hope we will really move, not just in some superficial way with a little Band-Aid out here, but as a major national priority.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. MURPHY. I agree whole-heartedly, Senator Simon. Before you walked in, I was just saying to Senator Kennedy that we feel in Massachusetts that we have made some major investments—we haven't scratched the surface of the need and the potential out there still investing in young people and preschoolers, toddlers. And clearly with the kind of data that is coming out of some national studies, it is a wise investment, and we have a long way to go in this major investment.

I don't, Senator Kennedy, read anything in the legislation which you are proposing right now which preempts or excludes or dampens local resources. I really do see this as additive. The more we can support, invest in this, and the more money we can put into it, the better I think we have our priorities upside down with the Reagan Administration; I share your views on this, and the faster we can get a Democratic President and change some of these investments, the more we will find young people staying in school, contributing later on, and getting a reasonable start on life in ways that open up opportunities for them.

So I share your values on this, and would just hope that we can move this legislation through as quickly as possible.

Senator SIMON. And if I could just—and I know I am taking too much time here, Mr. Chairman—but you mentioned Massachusetts not doing enough—no State does enough. And here at the Federal level, this fiscal year we will spend $19.5 billion for education out of a $1 trillion budget—2 percent. Are we really serious about our future or aren't we?

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation, but we are really kind of tiptoeing around what we ought to be assaulting. We are going to have to assault this problem if we are going to have a decent future for this country.

Ms. MURPHY. No State can do it with the magnitude of resources that the Federal Government can provide. And when the Federal Government finally steps in and makes the major commitment to child care and early childhood development, then we'll have the resources for doing this.

Senator SIMON. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Senator knows, of the $22 billion spent on education, roughly half of that is spent on higher education. And if we just look at these early, formative years, which we know are so incredibly essential and important, it is only a tiny fraction of education spending. So I think the point is well-made, and we will do our best, won't we, Evelyn, when we get together with President Dukakis?

Ms. MURPHY. We will indeed.

The CHAIRMAN. I think all of us in a serious way know that Senator Simon, not only on this Committee, but in the House of Representatives and in his books, has really been in the forefront with Senator Pell and Senator Stafford. And there has been no Senator who has really advocated the investment in education and in people as much as Senator Simon. It is a good message for all of us, and we certainly want to work with him and any future Administration to try and rearrange some of these priorities.

Thank you very much, Governor Murphy.

Ms. **Murphy**. Thank you very much.

The **Chairman**. Our next witness is Mary Hatwood Futrell. It is always a pleasure to welcome the President of the National Education Association. We are very appreciative of the NEA's early support of Smart Start and general leadership in the area of early childhood education and child care. The Committee is grateful that you could join us here today.

We want to thank you very much for the wonderful advocacy that your organization has offered in the area of education generally. I have had the opportunity to talk with you over the past years as we were facing the undercutting of some of the most basic and fundamental education programs. I think, as you remind us in every one of your statements and speeches, that you can rearrange priorities, and you can add more resources to this important area. But the minds which are lost when we have failed those young children are extremely difficult to ever regain. That has been a powerful message that comes through in all of your statements and a very important one. We look forward to hearing from you.

We will also welcome Althea Simmons, who is also on our second panel. She is the Director of the Washington Bureau of the NAACP. We have worked together on many issues; certainly, the future of our young children is one of the most important. We thank you for your strong support and for your helpful comments. Althea and I are becoming old friends—we have been old friends, but we have been seeing a lot of each other at meetings on a variety of important issues.

We want to thank both of you very much. We'll hear first from Ms. Futrell.

STATEMENTS OF MARY HATWOOD FUTRELL, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION; AND ALTHEA SIMMONS, DIRECTOR, WASHINGTON BUREAU, NAACP

Ms. **Futrell**. Thank you very much, Chairman Kennedy and Senator Simon.

I am Mary Hatwood Futrell, President of the National Education Association, and I appreciate the opportunity to talk with you today about the critical need for quality early childhood education programs and the important contribution the proposed Smart Start Program, Senate Bill 2270, would make in this area.

Educators, social scientists and psychologists have long recognized that the period from birth to five years of age is critical to the development of a person's cognitive abilities. Many of the thinking patterns, attitudes, and physical characteristics essential to learning are established well before a child starts first grade. But our Nation, unfortunately, has been slow to establish programs to meet these needs, and as a result, places many of our children in jeopardy.

Smart Start takes into account the fact that the needs for child care and early childhood education are diverse, and it calls for a high degree of coordination and cooperation among agencies.

Furthermore, the legislation reflects an understanding that in order to achieve our Nation's educational goals, many of America's young children need a comprehensive set of programs to address their nutritional, health, social, emotional and educational needs.

NEA views coordination as essential to the success of these programs and appropriately recipients at the State and local levels would be required to form advisory groups that include representatives of the school system, Head Start centers, community-based organizations and others.

This structure will help ensure that the programs funded under Smart Start expand and enhance rather than duplicate services provided to these children.

NEA wishes to lend its strong support to those aspects of the legislation that deal with teacher preparation, certification and inservice for persons working in the program. NEA has long maintained that the best way to ensure equity in education is through the provision of a qualified teacher in every classroom. But at present, too many persons working in early childhood programs are undertrained. Requiring that Smart Start programs employ persons with early childhood education backgrounds is critical to creating the unique environment in which young children can learn and grow.

Early childhood education should not be a watered-down version of kindergarten or first-grade curriculum, but instead involve activities that encourage discovery and allow children to pursue their interests and develop their unique skills and talents.

NEA also strongly supports Smart Start's emphasis on parental involvement and outreach.

NEA is active in a number of efforts to involve parents and families in education at all levels and building partnerships among families and school settings is nowhere more important than in preschool programs.

We strongly support various provisions of the legislation related to protection of children, including health and safety requirements, protections against discrimination, open access to ensure that disadvantaged children are not isolated from the community at-large, and protections against violations of Constitutional and statutory law regarding the separation of church and State.

The funds provided under Smart Start would make a significant contribution to the needs in the area of early childhood education. However, nothing in Congress' efforts to establish the Smart Start Program should detract from the ongoing need to enhance the level of resources provided to Head Start, Chapter I, and other programs for disadvantaged children and students.

Congress must continue its efforts to fully fund these programs until all eligible children are served.

Finally, there are important distinctions between child care and early childhood education, and NEA believes that the goals of the proposed Smart Start legislation are compatible with pending child care legislation such as the Act for Better Child Care and the new School Child Care Demonstration Project Act.

In our view, there are considerable unmet needs, both in the area of child care and early childhood education. By establishing and supporting both efforts and ensuring that these programs are coordinated at and among the local, State and national levels, Congress can make a significant contribution to the future of children served in the programs, to American families, and to our Nation's future.

I would like to thank you again for this opportunity to testify in support of Smart Start. I would urge the swift and unanimous passage of this bill. And I would be very happy to respond to questions.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Futrell and responses to questions of Senator Kennedy follow:]

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION

TESTIMONY
OF THE
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
ON
SMART START:
THE COMMUNITY COLLABORATIVE FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT AND CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE ACT
S. 2270

BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON
LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES
U.S. SENATE

PRESENTED BY
MARY HATWOOD FUTRELL
NEA PRESIDENT
MAY 11, 1988

MARY HATWOOD FUTRELL, President • KEITH GEIGER, Vice President • ROXANNE E. BRADSHAW, Secretary-Treasurer
DON CAMERON, Executive Director
(202) 822-7300

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I am Mary Hatwood Futrell, president of the National Education Association which represents 1.9 million education employees throughout the nation in elementary, secondary, vocational, and postsecondary schools. I appreciate the opportunity to talk with you today about the critical need for quality early childhood education programs and the important contribution the proposed Smart Start program, S. 2270, would make in this area.

NEA has long supported prekindergarten for the public schools, including child care, developmentally appropriate programs and curricula, and education for children with special needs. Quality early childhood education programs make sense from an academic, social, and economic standpoint, because they help ensure that children get the solid foundation necessary for later success. Members of this Committee are well aware of the serious needs of America's children. Hundreds of thousands of children enter school each year unprepared. Many have poor vocabulary skills, have the most fleeting attention spans, or suffer from poor health care, poor nutrition, and low self-esteem. These are the children who present the most formidable challenge in the effort to provide true equality in our educational system and in our society. And these conditions present a serious challenge to a nation striving to improve its educational system so that more of its citizens are fully prepared to be successful in the workplace and in life. But for a variety of social and political reasons we have not yet taken affirmative steps to deal with these problems in a comprehensive manner.

It is not only educators, researchers, and social scientists who have turned their attention to the needs of our preschool population. Economists, business leaders, and others dedicated to preserving America's place as a world leader now recognize that nutrition, health care, and education — including early education — are the essential elements in our drive to maintain national prosperity. It's clear that the answer to these needs will require a cooperative effort among families, educational institutions, and other social services.

Of the 40 million students enrolled in public elementary and secondary schools, one in two has a mother in the labor force, one in four is poor, one in five is at risk of becoming a teen parent, one in six has no health insurance, one in seven is at risk of dropping out of school, one in eight has limited proficiency in English, and one in 10 is physically or mentally handicapped.

These young people are the very ones our nation will need to drive the economy of the future with its emphasis on effective use of advanced technology, information, service, innovation, and adaptability. They are the ones who will be responsible for sustaining our democratic traditions and for carrying on our national ideals.

The proposed Smart Start legislation represents a sound approach to ameliorating a wide range of the obstacles to success in education, and appropriately calls for cooperation among federal, state, and local officials in close coordination with public schools.

Coordination with public schools

Educators, social scientists, and psychologists have long recognized that the period from birth to five years of age is critical to the development of a person's cognitive abilities. Many of the thinking patterns, attitudes, and physical characteristics essential to learning are established well before a child starts first grade. And yet, despite a long history of our knowledge of this, our nation has been slow to establish programs to meet these needs, and as a result places many of our nation's youngest children in jeopardy.

Smart Start takes into account the fact that the needs for child care and early childhood education are diverse, and, as a result, it calls for a high degree of coordination and cooperation among agencies. Recognizing there are a number of federal, state, and local programs designed to address the same needs, funds in this program may be used to expand or enhance services in existing programs, or they may be used to establish new programs in states and localities where none now exist. Furthermore, the legislation reflects an understanding that in order to achieve our nation's educational goals, many of America's young children need a comprehensive set of programs to address their nutritional, health, social, emotional, and educational needs.

NEA's 1984 report, An Open Letter to America on Schools, Students, and Tomorrow, outlining our recommendations for education reform, spoke to the issue of coordination:

> The problems students bring to their classes are becoming more diverse and complex each day. Their solution demands the experience, training, resources, and time that school staff members simply do not have.
>
> These problems cannot be addressed without the active help of appropriate service agencies. What schools can do is help coordinate the services these agencies offer. Schools, after all, are the natural focal point for reaching children and young adults. We recommend that local governments coordinate badly needed health and welfare services for our students through the school. This coordination should be carefully planned to make sure no instructional time is lost.

NEA views coordination as essential to the success of these programs, and, appropriately, recipients at the state and local level would be required to form advisory groups that include representatives of the school system, Head Start centers, community-based organizations, and others. This structure will help ensure that the programs funded under Smart Start expand and enhance, rather than duplicate, services provided to these children.

Pedagogical considerations

NEA wishes to lend its strong support to those aspects of the legislation that deal with teacher preparation, certification, and inservice standards for persons working in the program, as well as Smart Start's emphasis on parental involvement and outreach. Further, NEA endorses the provisions calling for balanced activities reflecting the findings of child development research. Schweinhart and Koshel, in discussing quality preschool programs, say:

> A high quality program maintains groups of no more than 20 children and a staff-child ratio of at least 1 adult for every 10 children. It employs staff members who are adequately trained in early childhood development, uses a curriculum model based on child development principles and with demonstrated effectiveness, fosters collaboration between teaching staff and parents, and is sensitive to children's health and nutrition needs and families' child care needs. (Policy Options for Preschool Programs. High/Scope Early Childhood Policy Paper No. 5. Ypsilanti, Mich., 1986)

NEA is concerned that, at present, too many early childhood personnel are undertrained. Only 10 percent of the Head Start workers have four-year degrees in early childhood education, and 18 percent have a Childhood Development Associate credential. Only 10 states and Washington, D.C. require at least one staff member in a child care center to hold a BS or BA degree, and only three states require that the degree be in early childhood education. NEA has long maintained that the best way to ensure equity in education is through the provision of a qualified teacher in every classroom. If the Smart Start programs are to be truly quality programs, Congress must establish high standards for those responsible for carrying them out.

Developmentally appropriate programs recognize that young children are concrete learners. They need lots of opportunities to learn by touch, through active involvement, by a variety of tactile activities involving gross and fine motor skills, as well as auditory and visual experiences. Piaget, in describing the critical period hypothesis, acknowledged that unless children were given opportunities to learn in these ways at the appropriate time, they would have difficulty in later years benefiting from a more formal abstract approach to education. Weikart states in a 1986 report on the High/Scope project: "(Policymakers should) resist the increasing pressures to teach young children facts and figures before they are ready and to focus instead on nurturing their special skills and abilities." Early childhood education should not be a watered-down version of kindergarten or first grade curriculum, but instead involve activities that encourage discovery and allow children to pursue their interests and develop their unique skills and talents.

NEA also strongly supports Smart Start's emphasis on parental involvement and outreach. NEA is active in a number of efforts to involve parents and families in education at all levels, but building partnerships among families and school settings is nowhere more important than in pre-school programs. The proposed measure's provisions ensuring access and involvement of parents have multiple benefits. Not only do these provisions establish a cooperative atmosphere that reinforces activities that take place in the programs, but they also give parents assurances about the health and safety of children in these programs.

Protection of children

NEA strongly supports various provisions of the legislation related to protection of children. The requirement that facilities where Smart Start programs are conducted be in compliance with local, state, and federal standards is important to ensure that children are in a safe, healthy environment. Provisions protecting against discrimination, for both program participants and staff, are essential, as they are in any federally assisted program. Moreover, the federal government has a responsibility to assure this early childhood education legislation is in compliance with constitutional and statutory law regarding the separation of church and state and protection of civil rights. Additionally, we commend the authors of the bill for provisions that would ensure a racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic balance among participants in the program. The federal government has a primary responsibility to fund early childhood education for disadvantaged children, but by opening up these programs to children of other socioeconomic levels and charging fees according to a sliding scale will ensure that disadvantaged children are not isolated from the community at large.

Funding considerations

The funds provided under Smart Start would make a significant contribution to the needs in the area of early childhood education. Moreover, the strong emphasis on coordination of services with other similar programs is important to ensure the programs will supplement, not supplant, existing early childhood education and child care. The federal government is already the largest source of funding for programs for three- and four-year-olds, providing as much as 85 percent of the public funding for such programs, according to the National Center for Education Statistics. This assistance, provided primarily through Head Start and Title XX Social Service block grants, is important. However, the largest federal expenditure for child care, the Dependent Care Tax Credit, is largely irrelevant to the incomes of poor families.

Up to now, the provision of federal assistance for child care has been a piecemeal approach. Head Start, for example, serves an estimated 450,000, or approximately 16 percent of the eligible children. We need a more comprehensive approach to the needs of working families. Nothing in the Congress efforts to establish the Smart Start program should detract from the ongoing need to enhance the level of resources provided to Head Start, Chapter 1, and other programs for disadvantaged children and students. In fact, Congress must continue its efforts to fully fund these programs until all eligible children are served.

Related legislation

Various proposals have been advanced in the 100th Congress to meet the needs in the area of child care. There are important distinctions between child care and early childhood education, and NEA believes that the goals of the proposed Smart Start legislation are compatible with pending child care legislation, such as the Act for Better Child Care, S. 1885/H.R. 3660, and the New School Child Care Demonstration Project Act, S. 1995/H.R.3841. In our view, there are considerable unmet needs, both in the area of child care and early childhood education. By establishing and supporting both efforts, and ensuring that these programs are coordinated at and among the local, state, and national levels, Congress can make a significant contribution to the future of children served in the programs, to American families, and to our nation's future economic vitality, national security, and social justice.

nea
EXECUTIVE OFFICE
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION • 1201 16th St., N.W., Washington, D C 20036-3290 • (202) 822-7000
MARY HATWOOD FUTRELL, President
KEITH GEIGER, Vice President
ROXANNE E. BRADSHAW, Secretary-Treasurer
DON CAMERON, Executive Director

June 3, 1988

The Honorable Edward Kennedy
Committee on Labor and Human Resources
428 Senate Dirksen Office Bldg.
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Kennedy:

I appreciate the recent opportunity to testify on the proposed Smart Start legislation, S. 2770, before your Committee on Labor and Human Resources. In an effort to help the Committee in its efforts to craft a bill that will make a significant contribution in the area of prekindergarten education, I would like to expand on my responses to two questions you posed to me during the May 11 hearing.

You asked me about the use of vouchers in child care in contrast to public elementary and secondary education programs. NEA recognizes that the Smart Start legislation does not contain any voucher mechanism, and we appreciate the authors' sensitivity to this issue and awareness of the potential harm vouchers could have for educational programs. The rationale against educational vouchers is well documented, and I refer you to the 1986 report of the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor entitled "Problems with the Administration's Voucher Proposal for Chapter 1" as a detailed outline of the educational, social, and legal problems educational vouchers would create.

NEA testified earlier this year that we could accept the use of vouchers in the Act for Better Child Care, S. 1885/H.R. 3660, precisely because the ABC bill would not permit funds to be used for educational programs that would supplant academic programs offered in the public schools and because the ABC bill, as introduced, has strong language prohibiting discrimination or violations of the constitutional separation of church and state. Moreover, there are significant differences between child care and early childhood education, some of which I outlined in my statement on Smart Start. There is a need for federal involvement in both areas, but it does not follow that the mechanisms to provide assistance are necessarily the same.

The most prudent investments build on existing programs. At present, most child care programs are not a part of the public schools, while most educational programs are. It is therefore fitting that for the sake of coordination and accountability, early childhood education programs should, when possible, take place within the public schools. Vouchers would only tend to scatter those children and resources, undermining the accountability and coordination that are keystones in the Smart Start bill.

Additionally, I would like to expand on my response to your question regarding the need for both the Smart Start and ABC bills. Clearly they would address quite different, but related needs.

First, I would like to again commend the authors of the Smart Start legislation for the emphasis on the training and certification requirements for persons staffing the Smart Start programs. The legislation would require that such persons possess appropriate training and experience in early childhood education. This is essential to achieving the desired educational outcomes of the program. Conversely, while it is desireable that persons staffing child care programs funded under the proposed ABC legislation have training in early childhood education, the emphasis of the programs is on quality child care, rather than education.

Second, while the Smart Start programs would be required to provide full-day care for participants, a significant portion of the program would be devoted to educational/developmental activities. Moreover, the Smart Start programs would be designed to serve primarily children between the ages of 3 and 5. In contrast, the ABC bill's emphasis would be on child care needs of children from infancy through age 15, including afterschool care for school-aged children. In our view, the Smart Start and ABC programs would complement each other, and consequently expand the choices available to families, by creating a network of related programs to fulfill the academic and care needs of young children.

Finally, NEA believes there is a need for both approaches driven by the breadth and severity of the problems facing young children. Our nation has seen a disturbing increase in the number of children at risk because of poverty and concomittant problems such as deficiencies in nutrition, health care, and exposure to positive role models. At best, even if Smart Start and ABC are enacted expeditiously, these federally funded programs will not meet all the needs of America's children. State and local governments and the private sector must continue to work together to find solutions to the problems of our nation's children, particularly those children at risk.

I hope the Committee will find this information useful, and I look forward to working with you to bring about the enactment of Smart Start.

Sincerely,

Mary Hatwood Futrell
President

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Maybe we will just ask a few questions of you here and the move on to Althea Simmons.

What do you think the public schools can really offer these children in the kind of settings which you outlined? I think you are quite eloquent in describing what should not be provided. What do you think the public school system can really offer to children at this age?

Ms. FUTRELL. I think that the public schools could offer a variety of services and programs. For example, we all know that in many of these areas, the largest portion of the budget has to be utilized for overhead, for physical facilities, for utilities, et cetera. By placing some of the programs in the public schools, we could offset the need to set aside large sums of money for the physical plant and the utilities. That would be one advantage.

Schools are generally very safe places in which to have children. That would be another advantage. By having the opportunity to work with the educators themselves, the educators who will be responsible for providing education kindergarten through twelfth grade, an opportunity to work with the teachers, to find out what are some of the concerns and needs, to coordinate services and that responsibility, I think that would be another advantage. The involvement of public school educators and the development and implementation of the program, I think would be a fourth area of advantage which would be offered by not only placing the program from the public schools, but working very closely with public school educators.

So those are just some of the examples where I think we could work very closely together, dealing with physical facilities, utilities, dealing with safety, health, nutrition, and working with the staff to develop and implement programs.

The CHAIRMAN. Distinguish for us the reasons why we ought not to use vouchers to deliver services. In the ABC program, we have voucher provisions, and I think Evelyn Murphy testified to the success of providing maximum flexibility to a number of the corporations in our own State. We do not have that provision in this program. Could you give us your own understanding as to why there ought to be a distinction between these two programs so that we are able to address that issue when others raise it?

Ms. FUTRELL. As we have worked with the ABC Coalition in putting together the ABC bill which is before Congress, and as we have worked with you, one of the very strong points NEA has tried to emphasize is that there should be a separation of church and State when it comes to funding. While we recognize that many of the child care programs are not in public schools, but are part of religious and/or private organizations, we understand the important role those institutions could serve as eligible service providers under the Act for the provision of nonsectarian child care services.

So what we tried to do is work for legislative language that indicates what kinds of services could be offered and what kinds should not. For example, we felt very strongly that the programs should not duplicate what we are offering in the public schools. So where you could have tutorial services, you could provide developmental type programs, the programs should not duplicate what we are doing in the area of instruction, et cetera.

Also, having a very real concern with reference to providing public resources to private or parochial schools, an understanding that we are grossly underfunded in the area of public education and in the area of providing child care in those institutions, to not tilt the balance in that direction.

We will be very happy to give you additional background information regarding our concern as it relates to not only vouchers/certificates, but also as it relates to separation of church and State—trying to be responsive to the needs of the American people in this area, but also being very concerned about eroding protections for children in those areas.

The CHAIRMAN. Can the school system work effectively with the various Head Start groups and other local groups that are providing early childhood services? What is your own assessment?

Ms. FUTRELL. My assessment is that in communities where we have Head Start programs that the public schools do work very closely with the leaders and with the staff members in those programs. Some are in the public schools; others are in private or religious establishments. Our major concern is that we work together to make sure the young people during the formative years have access to programs and services which will better prepare them to be successful once they enter the formal educational structure.

So we have worked very well with those agencies, and we have worked very positively with them. We agree that there is a need to expand those services, because we are not serving enough children, and so I think when you assess what has happened over the years, it has been very constructive and very positive.

The CHAIRMAN. Finally, do you see an advantage in having the public school systems work closely with whatever group is going to provide these services so that the transition into the school system is one that is comfortable for the children? It would seem to me that the logic of this is overwhelming, but could you address the importance of maintaining close links between service providers and the public school system and what it means for the children?

Ms. FUTRELL. I think that it is extremely important, and we are urging our members to become much more knowledgeable about and involved in this particular area, that we not only articulate very clearly what the program should provide, but how those programs should relate to what we are doing in the elementary and secondary grades, understanding fully that we should not have watered-down versions of kindergarten and first grade programs, but the programs should be developmentally appropriate.

But we believe that by working together in a coordinated fashion that we can provide a higher quality of service for children all the way through, early childhood education, elementary, and secondary, coordinate what those programs and services should look like, complement one another, be supportive of not only one another, but the children and the families who are being served.

Our members are very, very supportive of the concept of early childhood education and have been for a very long time, and we look forward to working with those agencies in our various communities.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Simon?

Senator SIMON. Just to follow through on the last question—you are saying that basically, in most instances, the public school is the natural vehicle to provide early childhood education. I don't want to be reading something into what you are saying, but is that correct?

Ms. FUTRELL. I would say that we believe that it is and can be, but we also fully recognize that in some communities, that would not be possible because of space, for example. So what we are saying is if space is available, we would certainly hope that school districts would offer that physical space. Whether these programs are in the public schools or not—and we would strongly urge for them to be there—we believe the public school officials, educators, should be involved in programs and the development of those programs, helping to implement coordinating services, et cetera, because all of it blends together, and what happens during those first five years will directly impact what will happen during the next twelve. So we all need to work together for a common goal, and that is how do we make sure all young people have access to the best education we can possibly provide.

If it is possible to put them in the public schools, we would certainly advocate that; but we are not closing the door on the programs being in other places.

Senator SIMON. I was interested, going through your testimony, where you talked about too many early childhood personnel are undertrained.

Ms. FUTRELL. Yes.

Senator SIMON. We went through a struggle when we passed 94-142, Aid for the Handicapped. The opponents said, "We are not going to have enough people to do this. We already have a shortage of personnel for teaching handicapped young people, and it will reduce the quality and so forth if we pass it."

We ended up passing it, and we ended up with a lot of people coming in, and we raised the quality of teachers. If we pass something like this, we are going to end up doing precisely the same.

Ms. FUTRELL. And we would certainly hope that that would be the outcome. We believe that right now, the quality is low. Only about ten percent of those who are involved in early childhood education have bachelor's or college degrees in this area; only about 18 States require personnel to meet certain standards. And what we are saying is that these children are as important as those who are in elementary and secondary schools, and the people who work with them should meet very high standards, should have professional training, because this is not just a babysitting program. This is a program to help young children develop, socially, emotionally, physically, and educationally, so that they can be much more successful, as I indicated earlier, during the formal instructional program.

So we would agree that the purpose of the legislation would say to States and localities: You will have to meet certain standards, as those standards relate not only to the program, but to the staff responsible for delivering that program to the young people.

Senator SIMON. You also use the phrase "childhood development associate credential"; that is a two-year credential, or what is that?

Ms. FUTRELL. We believe that there are in place in States programs offered through colleges and universities and other training institutions which could provide the necessary background and the necessary training for personnel to work with the young people who would be enrolled in these programs. And we believe that, rather than simply hire people and bring them in, and basically have a babysitting program, that these people should have a clearly-articulated program, a clearly-articulated curriculum, focusing on, as I indicated, the cognitive background of the young people who would be involved—and the programs are available.

Senator SIMON. I thank you once again.

The CHAIRMAN. As you know, in the legislation, we provide funding for the training of individuals who will be involved in these programs as well.

Finally, I would like to hear you explain how the ABC bill and the Smart Start program are complementary, and why you think both would be useful.

Ms. FUTRELL. Well, I think that the two are extremely useful, Mr. Chairman, because first of all, we among all of the industrialized nations in the world do not have universal child care for families in this country. The only other country to my knowledge which does not would be South Africa, and I do not like to compare the United States with South Africa under any circumstances.

We need to provide the services because we know that we have increasing numbers of families which do not have access to quality child care, and I think the children of America deserve better than that.

The ABC legislation tries to provide those services and those programs. And Smart Start emphasizes early childhood education. Smart Start, we believe, says to local communities and State communities: "Let's utilize the public schools and other available space and services in order to make sure children have access."

This is not just for middle-class families, but it is for low-income families as well. We will not discriminate. It is open to all children, all families.

So I believe that what you are doing is responding to a critical need in America. But we have absolutely too many children who do not have access to quality early childhood and child care programs; too many are in danger not only of not being allowed to develop cognitively, et cetera, but they are in danger as far as their health is concerned. And I think all of us should be tired of picking up the newspaper and reading about children who have been injured or killed because they did not have adequate child care—they were left in the care of another sibling, or they were left in the care of a provider who had too many young people or did not have proper training.

I turned on the TV the other day and read about another child who had fallen down a well. And I guess the question we have to ask ourselves is how many more children have to be injured or killed before we do something, and how many more families have to be told, "You will not have access to child care because you do not have the money" or because programs are not available.

So I think that what you are doing and what the ABC legislation is doing is responding to a critical need in America to provide quality early childhood and child care for the families in this country. That is where you complement each other.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Althea Simmons, we look forward to your testimony.

Ms. SIMMONS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Senator Simon.

Appearing before you two is like singing in the choir, because you have been very strong supporters of education throughout your careers.

The NAACP, through its 79-year history, has maintained that education for all children is a primary goal of a democratic society. We believe it is the great equalizer for most Americans. We believe it is a badge of opportunity for meaningful employment. And we believe it is mandatory if we are going to achieve and maintain our democratic tradition.

We cannot afford to waste our human resources, which means that we have to start training our youngsters early.

As early as 1977, the NAACP spoke out with reference to childhood education. In 1983 and 1985, we came back with other stronger positions, and just last year at our convention, our convention was so concerned about early childhood education that it mandated that each one of our State conferences would not only submit to our national board and to our regional directors a report on the progress of early childhood education in those States, but also that we would work from the Washington Bureau to ensure passage of early childhood legislation.

I think you can see that we do have a concern.

One of the things that we were also concerned about is the fact that when the Carnegie Foundation Report came out, it said that even though there had been progress made in education—and I want to quote a phrase—"it is irrelevant to many children, largely black and Hispanic, in our urban schools. There is a disturbing gap between reform, rhetoric and results."

I think that says something to us. We welcome this proposed legislation, and we even like the name of the bill, Smart Start, because we think that says to local educational agencies, to governmental entities, to parents, students and other community elements that this Nation believes in giving its youth a "smart start" toward equal opportunity in education.

We know that preschool programs work. Head Start is a prime example of what can be done with disadvantaged youth if they have that early childhood education through Head Start.

A lot of our poor parents, mostly single women—and, let me say, teen mothers—I think they would especially benefit from Smart Start, because four out of ten teenage kids drop out of school because they are expectant mothers. The future for those untrained youngsters is bleak, and unless they can secure the education or the skills to offer an employer for work, then they will never be able to get out of that bind.

I think your chart back there says it graphically. It shows that those youngsters who have early childhood education excel; those who don't have a difficult problem.

Therefore, the NAACP supports Smart Start. We think that an important feature of this initiative is the concept of community and governmental entities collaborating. And, as Ms. Futrell has said, that is going to free up additional resources, because resources that could not be used otherwise can now complement the resources currently in the pot.

We think that a lot of blacks, minorities, and other youngsters who are disadvantaged can receive a lot from a Smart Start initiative. Poor nutrition and health impact on cognitive development. Poor kids living in a single-parent home grow up continually poor. With Smart Start being all-around education—day care, dropout prevention program—it will enable many of our Nation's families to move toward self-sufficiency.

We must begin to provide good preschool education for our youngsters. We must begin to think in terms of it on a year-around basis. And I would say that we need to even think in terms of going down beyond age three and try and catch the top of the infants, because if we can catch them early enough, we can ensure that our Nation will have the kind of human resource development that is going to be vitally necessary by the year 2000 in a more technologically-oriented society.

We need to ensure that quality childhood development programs are run by adequately trained and salaried teachers.

I share the view that the persons who run these programs must be trained. I also share the view that we must bite the bullet and decide that our people who handle our most important human resources, our youngsters, must be adequately paid and that if that is done, we can salvage a lot of our young people.

I speak particularly about black youngsters, because right now we are behind the eightball, so many of them are dropping out of the system, and we have no effective way of bringing them back in. We think this might be an effective way of starting anew, a system whereby we can take our youngsters once they are born, right on through and ensure that they are developed in a meaningful way.

We believe that this measure builds on the successful Head Start concept and expands it so that the estimated 2.5 million eligible children for Head Start can reap the benefit of a program for preschoolers that is now available to only 16 percent of disadvantaged children. The full-day, full calendar year program will be particularly advantageous to low-income children who, as a result of a Smart Start, will have a better chance to realize their potential.

The NAACP hopes that the vital ingredient, parental participation, that has been so effective in Head Start will be a cornerstone of Smart Start. The success stories of youngsters who have been involved in Head Start graphically demonstrate that early childhood nourishment is good for the child, good for the parent, and good for society.

We urge the speedy passage of this measure out of this Committee, swift action by the Congress, so that this worthwhile initiative can become law.

We certainly appreciate this opportunity to testify on this measure, and we assure you, Mr. Chairman, that the NAACP, with its network of 2,300 branches, 500 youth councils and college chapters, will work very hard to get this measure passed.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Simmons follows:]

WASHINGTON BUREAU
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE
1025 VERMONT AVENUE, N.W. • SUITE 820 • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005
(202) 638-2269

STATEMENT

of

ALTHEA T. L. SIMMONS

DIRECTOR, WASHINGTON BUREAU

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE

before the

SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

on

S 2270

"SMART START: THE COMMUNITY COLLABORATIVE FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT ACT

May 11, 1988
10:00 a.m.
SD 430 Dirksen Senate Office Building

MARCH 2-4. NAACP LEGISLATIVE MOBILIZATION

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, I am Althea T. L. Simmons, Director of the Washington Bureau of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The NAACP is a 79 year old civil rights association with 2300 branches in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. We appreciate this opportunity to speak in support of S.2270 - "Smart Start: The Community Collaborative for Early Childhood Development Act of 1988."

The NAACP, throughout its 79-year history has maintained that education for all children is a primary goal of a democratic society. It is the equalizer for most Americans; it is the badge of opportunity for meaningful employment. Education is mandatory if the nation is to achieve and maintain its democratic tradition.

The NAACP, at its 78th Annual National Convention in New York last year adopted the following resolution regarding early childhood education:

Early Childhood Education

WHEREAS, access to a quality education is a major goal of the NAACP; and,

WHEREAS, the quality of early childhood pre-school educational experiences (3-5 years of age) can have a positive effect upon the future success of children at risk with preschool programs which mandate involvement, participation and early intervention with families of the children; and,

WHEREAS, the NAACP expressed its concern in regard to quality early childhood education in resolutions passed at its National Conventions in the years of 1977, 1983 and 1984, respectively;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the NAACP, in convention assembled, reaffirm its policy positions in this critical area; and,

BE IT ALSO RESOLVED, that each state conference of the NAACP is mandated to submit to the National Board of Directors and to the Regional Director a report on its progress and activities in the aforementioned, sixty days before the convening of each National Convention.

> BE IT ALSO RESOLVED, that the Washington Bureau work for the passage of early childhood education legislation;
>
> BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the NAACP directs all its units to work with publicly-funded day care, preschool and child development agencies to ensure provisions for comprehensive pre-school and child development programs for children within state-funded programs.

I think the Committee can see that the NAACP believes that there is a continuing role for organizations such as ours in not only working to get legislation passed, but also in monitoring to ensure that our preschoolers have the advantage of early childhood education.

As our nation moved toward the 21st Century, the struggle to achieve full and equal educational opportunities is more critical than ever before. The cry of alarm sounded in 1983 by the National Commission on Excellence in Education in its report, A Nation At Risk, has risen to a crescendo five years later. Although some progress has been made since 1983, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching reported this year that the educational reform movement:

> is irrelevant to many children--largely black and Hisoanic--in our urban schools .There is...a disturbing gap between reform rhetoric and results.

The indisputable fact is that our national crisis is that the educational system in this rich country is failing to educate our nation's children. The NAACP believes that the Federal government has the responsibility and obligation not only to identify and define the national interest in education, but also to guarantee equal opportunity in education and to encourage and support educational programs which promote economic prosperity, the national defense, and the maintenance and strengthening of our democratic institutions.

The NAACP welcomes this proposed legislation and commends the leadership of the Chairman and the bill's co-sponsors. Mr. Chairman, I must note that the NAACP likes the bill's name--"Smart Start"--because it alerts governmental entities, local educational agencies, parents, students and other elements of the community that this nation believes in giving its youth a "smart start" toward equal opportunity in education.

Benefits of Early Childhood Education

The NAACP knows that special programs for preschoolers work. The bold Headstart initiative begun more than two decades ago, as a cornerstone of President Johnson's War on Poverty, has been successful. Its major problem has been that not enough children are served.

Poverty among children has increased since the dawn of the Reagan era. Three million more children have become poorer since 1979, The number of poor minority children (nearly half of them black and one-third Hispanic) has increased and two-thirds of all black children who live in female-headed households are poor. These startling statistics graphically point up the need for early childhood on a massive scale.

Many poor parents, particularly single mothers, are faced with a simple but difficult decision: to stay at home with their young children because they cannot afford childcare or to spend almost one-third of their income for child care so that they can work. The average yearly childcare bill is roughly $2,500. A mother working at the minimum wage who earns $6,968 annually simply cannot afford to pay for childcare. Some would say that a mother working at the minimum wage cannot afford to work.

Teen mothers would especially benefit from "Smart Start". Four out of ten teen girls drop out of school because they are expectant mothers. The

The future for these untrained youth is bleak in that they lack the education and/or skills to offer an employer for work other than at the entry level. Their only hope is to return to school. This is complicated because they cannot afford childcare.

Good early childhood programs for disadvantaged children results in positive long-term results. It improves children's performance; starts a trend toward regular school success, and enables parents to work and thereby lessens their dependency on public assistance programs.

The New York University School of Education's study of the Harlem Headstart program found that Headstart participants were more than 50 percent more likely to finish high school than those who did not participate in the program. In addition, the children who participated in Headstart were also one-third more likely to continue their education beyond high school.

The NAACP supports "Smart Start" for several reasons:

- it provides an opportunity for expanded participation by providing financial assistance for "high quality child-centered, developmentally appropriatae early childhood education programs to prekindergarten children", especially low-income children;
- it appears to incorporate the unique features of Headstart;
- it provides a full workday, full calendar year program for prekindergarten children;
- it encourages pooling of resources and collaborative and coordinating efforts at every governmental level-- local, state and federal;
- it encourages the utilization of existing public school facilities as well as community resources which meet state and local safety code requirements;
- it recognizes the need for and provided assistance to local and state governments to make available family support for prenatal and parenting training to parents of prekindergarten children;
- it provides incentives for collaborative efforts in comprehensive early childhood services through community organiztions, schools and Headstart agencies.

An important feataure of the early childhood initiative is the concept of community and governmental entities collaborations in the delivery of early childhood services for more effective utilization of funds. This will be critical since a large population will be served. Even if a state elects not to utilize "Smart Start", a locality within a state can participate in "Smart Start". "Smart Start" will expand and upgrade existing programs, many of which are now being run through public schools or community-based organizations.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, poor children, may of whom are black and minority, receive far less help than their disadvantaged peers in making the transition to adulthood. Poor nutrition and health impact cognitive development. Poor children living with a single parent will grow up continually poor. "Smart Start", as an all-around education, daycare, dropout prevention program, literacy program would enable many of our nation's families to move toward self-sufficiency. Since over two-thirds of all black children are poor and many of these live in a single parent household, the childhood education envisioned in "Smart Start" would enable these mothers to go back to school and/or find better jobs.

What More Needs to be Done

Our nation must provide good preschool education for its youngsters--all of its youngsters--rich, poor, black, white, brown, native American. In addition to adequate preschool childcare year round, we must extend early childhood developmental programs to disadvantaged infants and toddlers so that these children and their parents can benefit from Headstart/Perry School type services.

We need to insure that quality child development programs are run by adequately trained and salaried teachers.

How Pending Legislation Addresses the Need

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, S 2270 builds on the successful Headstart concept and expands it so that the estimated 2.5 million eligible children for Headstart can reap the benefit of a program for preschoolers that is now available to only 16% of disadvantaged children.

The full-day, full calendar year program will be particularly advantageous to low-income children, who, as a result of a "Smart Start" will have a better chance to realize their potential.

Conclusion

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, the NAACP wholeheartedly supports Smart Start because good early childhood education programs for disadvantaged children results in positive, long-term results. A good preschool program improves children's performance and starts a trend toweard regular school success. Access to good preschool programs enables parents to work and lessen their dependency on public assistance programs.

The NAACP hopes that the vital ingredient of parental participation, so effective in Headstart, will be a cornerstone of "Smart Start". The success stories of children who have been involved in Headstart graphically demonstrate that early educational nourishment is good for the child, good for the parent, and is good for society.

We urge speedy passage of this measure out of Committee, swift action by the Congress so that the worthwhile initiative can become law.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify on S 2270.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, thank you very much, Ms. Simmons.

I don't think you would get any argument on the importance of even earlier childhood intervention—as a matter of fact, in the legislation we provide if you can serve all the four-year-olds, you can start taking a look at the three-year-olds as well. But we are going to try and see if we can at least make this one fly first and build on its successes in expanding it.

We also give emphasis to existing programs, in order to build on those programs rather than initiating new programs which is more costly. Would you agree with this strategy?

Ms. SIMMONS. Yes, we do, that's right, because so frequently when you've got a good program, just about the time the program gets off the ground, then it is not funded again and you have to start all over again.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you see the advantage of serving both poor children and more economically advantaged children in the same program?

Ms. SIMMONS. Yes, because I think as a matter of fact, because of the diversity in our Nation, we need to have that mix of youngsters. It helps both sets of youngsters. So therefore, we think this is important in this measure.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Simon?

Senator SIMON. If I could just comment, we need that mix, but it is very, very tough to get in the City of Chicago, for example, in a great many areas.

Ms. SIMMONS. That is an evil of segregation.

Senator SIMON. I hope we can in a variety of other ways, including some civil rights legislation in the housing field, move in the right direction. Right now in the Robert Taylor homes in the City of Chicago, in the Beethoven School, there is a preschool education program that has been started. Irving Harris, whose son Bill Harris is from your State, has helped in the financing of it. And there is just no question, that if we give these young people a chance earlier, the difference in later life is just going to be very, very significant. And I would just thank you for coming up, as you have on so many other occasions, to help on a good cause.

I thank both of you for your leadership.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Simon.

Thank you very much.

On our third panel, we have two distinguished individuals. Mr. Al Shanker, President of the American Federation of Teachers, has testified before the Committee numerous times on issues of importance in the area of education. We are always interested in his views. Obviously, a program like Smart Start will affect teachers around the country, and we welcome the opportunity to hear from Mr. Shanker this morning. He has been a long-time personal friend.

Constance Clayton is Superintendent of the Philadelphia School District. Ms. Clayton is representing the Council of Great City Schools. We express our gratitude to the Council for their continued and outstanding assistance with the legislation. We welcome you.

Mr. Shanker, we are glad to have you here and look forward to your testimony.

STATEMENTS OF ALBERT SHANKER, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS; AND CONSTANCE CLAYTON, SUPERINTENDENT, PHILADELPHIA SCHOOL DISTRICT, ON BEHALF OF COUNCIL OF GREAT CITY SCHOOLS

Mr. SHANKER. Thank you very much for this opportunity to express the views of the American Federation of Teachers, an organization that represents more than 650,000 members, all of whom are vitally concerned with child care and providing Federal support for early childhood education programs.

The shortage of safe, high-quality child care in the United States is simultaneously an education, an economic and family issue.

We know that our economy has changed rapidly over the last decade and that students must now be educated to levels never before attempted for all. The jobs that used to be available to relatively unskilled workers have disappeared. At the same time, the demographics of our work force have changed dramatically over the last few years as women with children entered the job market in huge numbers.

These two facts have led our Nation to the realization that day care and early childhood education are important issues for our country's economic future as well as for our children's future.

S. 2270, the Smart Start bill, represents an important step toward meeting the needs of America's families. The notion expressed in this bill, that it is important to provide equal educational opportunities and start children on the road to success early, is one that the AFT shares and strongly endorses.

We believe, as do the sponsors of this bill, that there is a Federal role in providing leadership and support to families in need of the type of services that S. 2270 would provide.

The AFT also shares with the sponsors of this bill a desire to get the Federal Government into the role it performs best—that of protecting and advancing the interests of our Nation's disadvantaged.

Smart Start will clearly focus on providing the bulk of its support to the disadvantaged. We endorse that emphasis because in a time of budgetary pressure, those who need services but are unable to afford them must be served first. Ideally, however, a Smart Start program should include any child whose parents wish to avail themselves of this opportunity. We note that a sliding scale fee structure will allow the participation of children who do not come from poor families.

The AFT believes that providing a child care setting that includes children from all economic, racial and social backgrounds is an important goal and consistent with our common school ideal.

The AFT is concerned about how the Smart Start bill would operate in conjunction with Head Start, which attempts to meet many of the same needs as S. 2270. We note that Smart Start would supplement Head Start and allow for the operation of full-day programs. This is a positive development.

However, with the requirement for matching funds, which Head Start does not have, it seems that the relationship between these two programs will have to be more clearly spelled out.

As you know, the States have been leading the effort to increase the availability of pre-kindergarten programs. In most cases, these efforts have been under the auspices of State education authorities. The AFT believes that education agencies should be the prime sponsor of new early childhood education programs. The Smart Start bill leaves this important matter unresolved. The bill makes the Department of Education the Federal agency responsible for the administration of Smart Start. This is an appropriate decision, yet other Federal child care efforts, Head Start and Title XX, are currently under HHS jurisdiction.

We believe, however, that the education community at all levels has the major role to play in a new program such as Smart Start. When the AFT opposed separation of the education function from the Department of HEW, we expressed doubts over how an early childhood education program could be managed if education were in a separate department and other child care programs stayed in the old HEW structure.

Now that this fear has been realized, we believe that the Education Department should administer Smart Start, yet some kid of national coordination between Smart Start and existing programs should be contemplated.

We are also concerned with the mechanism for choosing an administrative agency at the State level. The "Lead State Agency" called for in S. 2270 would play a very important role in determining the content and scope of Smart Start programs. Because of the critical nature of these choices, the AFT would like to see more preference given to State education departments in the role of lead agency.

It is important to note that Smart Start will seek to build and coordinate with programs that are already in place. Most of the non-Federal programs are part of the education effort of State and local governments. Moreover, the new funding that Smart Start will leverage will almost certainly be credited to the education budgets of the various States.

Given this likelihood and given the fact that one major goal of Smart Start is increasing the school success of at-risk children, a larger role for education seems warranted.

Likewise, we believe that at the local level, the mechanism for choosing the administering agency should emphasize the local education agency more than the bill requires. It is important to note that in most jurisdictions, the school district is independent, and the local school services and child development agencies are part of the general unit of local government. This poses a dilemma for the operation of Smart Start—where will the local funds come from, and who will be responsible for their use?

We believe that local school districts should have the first opportunity to become the local administering agency.

Although we support a major role for education agencies, we do not support some developing practices being initiated by such agencies. The AFT does not endorse standardized testing of preschool students to determine readiness to enter or exit from kindergarten.

Retention of students at this level is foolishness of the highest order and is virtually guaranteed to cause a child problems later in his or her school career.

What is needed in early childhood and in kindergarten programs is an individual and developmental approach, and flexibility for serving the needs of young children.

The AFT believes that any program that seeks to serve young children in the name of appropriate early childhood education must not be modelled after a grade-school setting. The AFT strongly supports the requirement that curricula be flexible, and standardized tests not be used to track children. The school setting should fit the needs of the child rather than having children be made to fit into some predetermined and uniform conception of schooling.

The minimum standards contained in S. 2270 are adequate. Another good reason for using the local education agency is the fact that meeting these kinds of standards is something that schools do all the time. However, training requirements for noncertified personnel seem to be inadequate. More than two days' training will be required to make sure that the needs of young children are met, especially in the light of the aim of high-quality programs.

We welcome the requirement for 15 hours per year of in-service training and hope that even more training will be available.

In conclusion, the AFT welcomes S. 2270. It is a welcome initiative in the vital field of early childhood education. We have some doubts about administrative mechanisms used to deliver Smart Start programs, and we are concerned about the relationship between Smart Start and Head Start.

Nevertheless, we believe that the time for this legislation has arrived. We congratulate the sponsors of this bill, especially Senator Kennedy, for taking the leadership on a vital issue for children and the families of our country.

Smart Start together with Head Start and the ABC Child Care Bill will form the core of an initiative on behalf of young children that is long overdue.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Shanker and responses to questions submitted by Senator Kennedy follow]:

TESTIMONY OF
ALBERT SHANKER, PRESIDENT
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS
BEFORE THE SENATE LABOR COMMITTEE
ON S.2270, SMART START

May 11, 1988

My name is Albert Shanker, and I am President of the American Federation of Teachers, an organization of more than 650,000 members who are vitally concerned with childcare and with providing federal support for early childhood education programs. The shortage of safe, high-quality childcare in the United States is simultaneously an education, an economic and a family issue. We know that our economy has changed rapidly over the last decade and that students must now be educated to levels never before attempted for all. The jobs that used to be available to relatively unskilled workers have disappeared. At the same time, the demographics of our work force have changed dramatically over the last few years as women with children entered the job market in huge numbers. These two facts have led our nation to the realization that daycare and early childhood education are important issues for our country's economic future as well as for our children's future.

S.2270, the Smart Start bill, represents an important step toward meeting the needs of America's families. The notion expressed in this bill, that it is important to provide equal educational opportunities and start children on the road to success early, is one that the AFT shares and strongly endorses. We believe, as do the sponsors of this bill, that there is a federal role in providing leadership and support to families in need of the type of services that S.2270 would provide. The AFT also shares with the sponsors of this bill a desire to get the federal government into the role it performs best, that of protecting and advancing the interests of our nation's disadvantaged. Smart Start will clearly focus on providing the bulk of its support to the disadvantaged. We endorse that emphasis because in a time of budgetary pressure those who need services but are unable to afford them must be served first. Ideally, however, a Smart Start program should include any child whose parents wish to avail themselves of this opportunity. We note that a sliding scale fee structure will allow the participation of children who do not come from poor families. The AFT believes that providing a childcare setting that includes children from all economic, racial and social backgrounds is an important goal and consistent with our common school ideal.

The AFT is concerned about how the Smart Start bill would operate in conjunction with Headstart, which attempts to meet many of the same needs as S.2270. We note that Smart Start would supplement Headstart and allow for the operation of full day programs. This is a positive development. However, with the requirement for matching funds, which Headstart does not have, it seems that the relationship between these two programs will have to be more clearly spelled out.

As you know, the states have been leading the effort to increase the availability of pre-kindergarten programs. In most cases these efforts have been under the auspices of state education authorities. The AFT believes that education agencies should be the prime sponsor of new early childhood education programs. The Smart Start bill leaves this important matter unresolved. The bill makes the Department of Education the federal agency responsible for the administration of Smart Start. This is an appropriate decision, yet, other federal childcare efforts, Headstart and Title XX are currently under HHS jurisdiction. We believe, however, that the Education community at all levels has the major role to play in a new program such as Smart Start. When the AFT opposed separation of the education function from the Department of HEW, we expressed doubts over how an early childhood education program could be managed if education were in a separate department and other childcare programs stayed in the old HEW structure. Now that this fear has been realized, we believe that the education department should administer Smart Start, yet, some kind of national coordination between Smart Start and existing programs should be contemplated.

We are also concerned with the mechanism for choosing an administrative agency at the state level. The "Lead State Agency" called for in S.2270 would play a very important role in determining the content and scope of Smart Start programs. Because of the critical nature of these choices, the AFT would like to see more preference given to state education departments in the role of Lead Agency. It is important to note that Smart Start will seek to build and coordinate with programs that are already in place. Most of the non-federal programs are part of the education effort of state and local governments. Moreover, the new funding that Smart Start will leverage will almost certainly be credited to the education budgets of the various states. Given this likelihood and given the fact that one major goal of Smart Start is increasing the school success of at-risk children, a larger role for education seems warranted.

Likewise, we believe that at the local level the mechanism for choosing the administering agency should emphasize the local education agency more than the bill requires. It is important to note that in most jurisdictions the school district is independent and the local social services and child development agencies are part of the general unit of local government. This poses a dilemma for the operation of Smart Start: where will the local funds come from and who will be responsible for their use? We believe that local school districts should have the first opportunity to become the local administering agency.

Although we support a major role for education agencies, we do not support some developing practices being initiated by such agencies. The AFT does not endorse standardized testing of pre-school students to determine readiness to enter or exit from kindergarten. Retention at this level is foolishness of the highest order and is virtually guaranteed to cause a child problems later in his or her school career. What is needed in early childhood and in kindergarten programs is an individual and developmental approach, and flexibility for serving the needs of young children. The AFT believes that any program that seeks to serve young children in the name of appropriate early childhood education must not be modeled after a grade-school setting. The AFT strongly supports the requirement that curricula be flexible and standardized tests not be used to track children. The school setting should fit the needs of the child rather than having children be made to fit into some predetermined and uniform conception of schooling.

The minimum standards contained in S.2270 are adequate. (Another good reason for using the local education agency is the fact that meeting these kinds of standards is something that schools do all the time. However, training requirements for non-certified personnel seems to be inadequate. More than two days training will be required to make sure that the needs of young children are met especially in light of the aim of high quality programs. We welcome the requirement for 15 hours per year of in-service training, and hope that even more training will be available.

In conclusion, the AFT welcomes S.2270. It is a welcome initiative in the vital field of early childhood education. We have some doubts about administrative mechanisms used to deliver Smart Start programs, and we are concerned about the relationship between Smart Start and Headstart. Nevertheless, we believe that the time for this legislation has arrived. We congratulate the sponsors of this bill, especially Senator Kennedy, for taking the leadership on a vital issue for the children and families of our country. Smart Start, together with Headstart and the ABC childcare bill, will form the core of an initiative on behalf of young children that is long overdue.

opeiu#2/aflcio

Smartst (filename)

QUESTIONS FOR ALBERT SHANKER:

O IN YOUR RESPONSE TO THE COMMITTEE'S QUESTIONS AT THE HEARING, YOU SUGGESTED THAT, FOR INITIATION OF NEW PROGRAMS UNDER SMART START, PRIORITY SHOULD BE GIVEN TO PROGRAMS WHICH WOULD BE ADMINISTERED THROUGH STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES. SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN SOME AREAS HAVE INDICATED TO US THAT THEY WOULD NOT WANT TO RUN PROGRAMS FOR THE PRE-SCHOOL AGE-GROUP, BECAUSE THEY HAVE NO SPACE, BECAUSE THEY FEEL THE PROGRAMS FOR THIS AGE-GROUP ARE MORE APPROPRIATELY ADMINISTERED ELSEWHERE, OR FOR OTHER REASONS. GIVEN THE DIFFERING NEEDS, RESOURCES, AND INTERESTS OF VARIOUS COMMUNITIES, IS IT ADVISABLE TO GIVE ONE AGENCY PRIORITY OVER ANOTHER FOR THE INITIATION OF NEW PROGRAMS, OR IS IT SUFFICIENT TO REQUIRE THAT ALL RELEVANT AGENCIES AND INTEREST GROUPS BE A PART OF THE BODY MAKING THE DECISION AS TO WHICH THE APPROPRIATE SERVICE PROVIDER SHOULD BE (I.E. THE INTERAGENCY POLICY GROUP)?

O THE INTERAGENCY TASK GROUP AT THE STATE LEVEL AND THE POLICY GROUP AT THE LOCAL LEVEL ARE THE BODIES WHICH WILL SET POLICY AS TO HOW SERVICES SHOULD BE DELIVERED IN A PARTICULAR LOCALITY. THE "LEAD" ADMINISTERING AGENCIES WILL SIMPLY BE CARRYING OUT A PLAN DEVELOPED BY THESE GROUPS. THE GROUPS WOULD BE CREATED TO BRING TOGETHER THE EDUCATION AND CHILD CARE COMMUNITIES SO THAT THE RECIPIENTS OF SMART START SERVICES WOULD BENEFIT FROM THE EXPERTISE EACH HAS TO OFFER THEM. WHAT DO YOU SEE AS THE IMPACT OF THESE COOPERATIVE MECHANISMS?

O IN YOUR PREPARED TESTIMONY, YOU SEEK TO PROTECT HEAD START PROGRAMS BY STRESSING THE NEED FOR COORDINATION WITH THEM. HOW DO YOU RECONCILE THIS CONCERN WITH YOUR SUGGESTION THAT EDUCATION DEPARTMENTS BE REQUIRED TO ADMINISTER SMART START PROGRAMS, EFFECTIVELY PRECLUDING PARTICIPATION IN SMART START BY HEAD START?

O SOME GROUPS HAVE EXPRESSED CONCERN THAT PUBLIC SCHOOLS ARE NOT QUALIFIED TO RUN PROGRAMS FOR YOUNG CHILDREN AND HAVE URGED US TO USE SMART START ONLY TO EXPAND HEAD START. HOW WOULD YOU COUNTER THIS ARGUMENT?

Responses to questions for Albert Shanker, President of the American Federation of Teachers.

- Question one poses a choice that need not be made. The AFT supports designating school districts as the sponsor of choice. If for some reason the school district is unwilling or unable to administer smart start programs other service providers should be selected to operate and administer the program. It is not sufficient in the view of the AFT to simply designate school districts as members of the interagency policy group.

- The interagency mechanism should have a positive effect on the coordination of smart start services. Child care services have long suffered from a lack of coordination and cooperation. If this mechanism works it could result in improvements in all child care programs currently in operation. Using a unified administrative unit such as school districts would also improve the existing situation by stabilizing programs and encouraging all concerned to focus on the services being provided in the school structure.

- The administration of smart start programs on the local and state levels by education departments would not preclude participation by Headstart programs anymore than using the Federal Education Department rather than H.H.S. will. Unlike Headstart, Smart Start will require substantial non-federal matching funds which will no doubt be part of a state or local education budget. It is the view of the AFT that schools can provide the smart start program with a financial stability that will not be found if smart start is relegated to other funding sources. The proposed interagency policy groups should be continued with all of the authority proposed in S.2270, except for the choice of the operating agency. In the case that the school district does not avail itself of the opportunity to be the operating agency the interagency policy group should then make the choice from the remaining eligible agencies.

- The argument that public schools are not qualified to run programs for young children does not hold water. Public schools are the agency created by the public to run programs for children. Public schools have experience in the area of meeting rigorous child safety standards and in the screening of personnel who deal with children. Furthermore smart start is designed to increase the effectiveness of at risk children in the school environment. What better institution to operate this program than the one which will eventually serve the children enrolled in smart start. In asserting these facts we do not say that all public schools are ready to operate smart start in a way contemplated by S.2270. AFT testimony makes it clear that we do not believe that the traditional grade school program is appropriate for smart start. We strongly endorse the prohibitions in S.2270 against tracking or standardized tests as tools for placement of smart start students.

The **Chairman**. Thank you very much, Mr. Shanker.

I think in your final statement, you really sum up what I think all of us on this Committee are strongly committed to, and that is ensuring that the Head Start Program is going to continue to function and grow. It has been an absolute and vital link, particularly over these past several years. We are also going to work through the ABC program that is going to create, hopefully, with a nationwide day care program. What we want to do, is provide an appropriate educational component for four-year-olds, and then, hopefully build from there.

As you indicate in your testimony, we have left the decision about which State and local agency will lead in the administration of the program to local discretion. This allows States to build on existing programs rather than start from scratch where they already have a program in place. In fact, Smart Start places a priority on the expansion of existing programs where they exist over the initiation of new programs.

As you have indicated, many States have begun programs through their schools, and these would be eligible for expansion under Smart Start; but where a State or community has already established an early childhood education program through its human services department, for example, wouldn't it be duplicative and perhaps unnecessarily rigid for the Federal Government to dictate that the local education agency must run the programs?

Mr. **Shanker**. We do recognize that there are other agencies running some very good programs, and we certainly don't want to hurt those. On the other hand, where new programs are being established, we think there ought to be a preference for the local education agencies.

Two points support giving some sort of favored status to the education agency: One is that where you have separate agencies conducting programs that are essentially meant to be in a type of sequence or continuity, in order to help kids do better later on in school, having separate agencies essentially creates a new coordination problem. And unfortunately, we know that agencies don't coordinate very well in these areas.

The second point is that when something like this becomes part of a school system, it becomes part of something that the public expects to maintain and to keep. As we hit hard times, you don't see schools closing their first grade and second grade. The schools are there, and maybe in hard times classes get a little larger or teachers' salaries don't move up as quickly, but it is a very permanent institution.

If we were to incorporate Smart Start into a school system and create the expectation that this is part of the education of a child, I think it would have the kind of protection which most programs of this type don't have in other agencies. We tend to get these big spurts of feeling that we ought to do something—and thank God that we do—but then we spend years trying to protect the program and prevent cutbacks and so forth.

So I think that in light of both of those issues, it would be important to lean in the direction of the education agencies as far as possible.

The **Chairman**. As we talked in the earlier part of the day, I think all of us recognize the educational nature of the program, and the need to provide continuity with the public school program.

We have seen some situations where, perhaps because of the restrictions and availability of space and other difficulties, public school systems are unable to provide preschool services. We recognize, as was pointed out this morning, that when the facility is there and the utilities are there, you can maximize resources by using the existing structure of the school. But we also want to involve ABC funded centers and Head Start. Indeed, the local community may make a judgment that Smart Start ought to be provided in a non-school setting. I think there is a recognition of the need for community control and fexibility in the legislation. We want to try and work out your concerns as we roll through the course of the hearings. We are all trying to reach the same ideal. Obviously, we want to move these young children into the education system that offers the greater opportunity for development.

But we also try to recognize that other effective programs, for example, Head Start, are administered through the human services department. We do want to maintain flexibility and emphasize developmentally appropriate education. We want to work closely with you and others to find the way to do this that will bring the greatest benefit to children.

Senator Simon?

Senator **Simon**. First, I want to join in welcoming both of you. Al Shanker, we appreciate the leadership you have given, and Dr. Clayton, in the Philadelphia schools.

Since you have been talking about structure, and you mentioned Head Start, do you see any disadvantage in having Head Start as part of the Department of Education?

Mr. **Shanker**. We do not have an organizational view right now, but I think that where Head Start is right now was undoubtedly a result of the tough fight over the creation of the Department, and I think it does belong in the Department of Education.

Senator **Simon**. In terms of having the local education agency ordinarily being the lead on this, I agree. But I also agree with your statement where you say it must not be modelled after a grade-school setting. And I don't mean any disrespect to you here, Dr. Clayton, when I say I have learned, as you both have learned that sometimes school administrators are not the most creative people in the world. How do we make sure that we really have a non-rigid kind of a setting so that we really do provide that bridge that the kids really need?

Mr. **Shanker**. I agree with what you are saying. I just disagree with one little thing. I don't think the problem is the school administrators. I think that when there are educational crises, there is a big public push to create some kind of instant improvement in education. For instance, when Sputnik went up, one of the effects was to take the second grade curriculum and put it in first grade on the basis that if we got the kids to do second grade work earlier, everything would be fine. Of course, one result was that a lot of first grade kids who weren't ready to do second grade work came to feel that they were stupid and dropped out in their own heads and stopped trying. And I suppose we could do that again by shoving the curriculum we have now down to kindergarten and down to four-year-olds and three-year-olds. I don't want to see that happen.

There is no guarantee that people won't do that, and unfortunately, large segments of the public sometimes support that and so it becomes a political decision.

I think we need to educate both educators and the general public about what happens when you create a sense of failure. Education is not something that someone can give to somebody. If I could give it to somebody, then any kid who ever sat in front of me would have it, because I gave them a lot—but they weren't all listening all the time. People educate themselves. That's the only way to get an education. Others can help you in terms of connecting you with different people and objects and things and experiences and everything else, but often that it's you who choose to learn.

But people stop trying to educate themselves if they feel they are stupid or that they are going to look silly in front of their colleagues if they try. We see kids in the second or third grade who in a sense have already dropped out. They are saying, "If I try, I'm going to look stupid, and I'm not going to get it right, so I'm not even going to try." That child is educationally finished unless we can somehow change his spirit.

We need to educate the public that this is just a wrong thing to do to children during their development; that the one thing you've got going for you as a parent or teacher is the willingness of the kid to try. The best way to beat that out of a child is to get him to do something, force him to do something he is not ready to do, in the presence of all of his classmates. You do that a few times, and that child is finished.

Think of these tests that are now being given to kindergarten kids—standardized tests, and if you don't pass the test you are already a failure; you are left back in kindergarten.

Now, not only does it knock the kid for a loop, but these standardized tests do not tell you anything about individual kids. A standardized test tells you a lot about a class or a school, because the few errors that one kid makes one way and another makes the other way all average out, and they'll give you a pretty good picture of what the class does. But when you use a test of that sort to determine whether one individual child is going to move up or not, there is no knowledgeable person who will support it. There is a whole State now that has enacted this, and I can assure you that the Governor of that State and the members of the legislature feel that they are going to get an awful lot of public support, because now they are getting tough with the kids or helping them. It is a political issue.

The CHAIRMAN. What State is it, Al?

Mr. SHANKER. Georgia. Georgia just enacted that.

And you may find some other States following. Politically, it sounds great. The man or woman on the street who isn't thinking about it says, well, that's great; they're getting tough. The politicians are going to show those educators, and the five-year-old kid is going to realize that he or she has got to do some homework to get out of kindergarten. It is a political issue, not an educational issue.

I think it is our job as educators to talk to parents and businessmen about those issues. I think we ought to be talking to more business people. They are assuming greater and greater responsibility. I was very happy to be an advisor to the CED on both of their reports and to see Brad Butler here and the wonderful role he has played in supporting various educational programs, especially for the disadvantaged. But I think an educational program is the only answer. It is not a political issue.

Senator SIMON. Thank you very much, and thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. We want to work with you on that. Education central to the Smart Start Legislation. I am convinced that we can achieve a satisfactory outcome because I think we all know where the point of departure is on this. I think there have been some "red herrings" raised on this question, but there are some legitimate concerns as well. So we will look forward to working closely with you on it.

Mr. SHANKER. Fine.

The CHAIRMAN. Ms. Clayton, we are delighted to have you here.

Ms. CLAYTON. Thank you very much, Senator Kennedy, Senator Simon. Good morning.

My name is Constance Clayton. I am the Superintendent of Schools for the School District of Philadelphia and co-Chair of the Legislative Standing Committee of the Council of the Great City Schools, on whose behalf I appear today.

I am pleased and honored to have this opportunity to testify this morning on "Smart Start" and to thank the Chair personally for his leadership in the crucial area of early childhood development.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Council of the Great City Schools, I strongly endorse Senate Bill 2270, "the Community Collaborative for Early Childhood Development Act." The Council and its member districts pledge to work enthusiastically for passage of this important legislation.

"Smart Start" provides the United States Congress an opportunity to enhance the life chances for millions of our inner-city youth by investing in their development early and comprehensively.

The benefits of early education are clear, considerable and lasting. Mr. Chairman, your own review of the Perry Preschool Study underscores that preschool education has demonstrably positive effects on rates of high school graduation, post-secondary education, literacy, employment, welfare dependence and criminal involvement.

Moreover, a recent report by the House Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, titled Opportunities for Success: Cost-Effectiveness Programs for Children, 1988, reviewed 20 years of research and concluded that children who had the experience of early childhood education compared favorably with those who had not and exhibited a number of important characteristics such as: improved student self-confidence, self-esteem and expectations; increased school success; increased employability; reduced dependence on public assistance; decreased criminal activity.

Our own experience in Philadelphia reflects those benefits, and also sustained parental participation through the elementary grades.

In addition to Philadelphia's historic contributions to the formation of our country, our local public schools have played a key role in shaping how our Nation views the education of young children. The Philadelphia Public Schools were the first in the Nation to introduce kindergarten systemwide. We have had kindergartens at every school site since 1887. The School District has also offered a highly successful child care program for low-delete space to-medium-income children since the early 1940s.

The mid-1950s saw the introduction of parent cooperative nurseries which serve low-delete space to-medium-income families. And since the 1960s, the school system has operated several of the largest in-school Head Start and Title XX programs in the country. More than 150,000 students in the city have received early childhood services since then.

Presently, our school system operates four major preschool programs: Child Care, Get Set Day Care, Parent Cooperative Nurseries, and Pre-Kindergarten Head Start. Our child care program serves 1,400 children and youth ranging in age from three months to eleven years, from seven a.m. to six p.m. every weekday, 12 months a year, in 17 centers. A longitudinal study of these students over eight years from kindergarten to grade eight indicates that by grade eight, more than 80 percent equalled or exceeded national mathematics norms and about 67 percent equalled or exceeded national reading norms—in comparison to only 40 percent for nonparticipating youngsters.

Our Get Set program serves 2,400 children ranging in age from two years to eleven years full-day, full-year, at 44 sites. A longitudinal study tracked them from kindergarten to grade eleven, and found that 98 percent have equalled or exceeded national norms in mathematics and 82 percent in reading.

Similar results have been shown by our Parent Cooperative Nurseries which serve 440 preschool children ten months a year half-day, and our Pre-Kindergarten Head Start Program, which serves 1,700 three and four year-olds all day for ten months per year. In each case, longitudinal studies over nearly ten years show participating students at or above the national norm in reading and mathematics.

Studies conducted by our Department of Research and Evaluation credit these programs and other efforts with raising the district-wide achievement test score average above the national norm, reducing the number of students retained in grade, and decreasing the numbers of children assigned to special education classes.

Research on early childhood programs in Detroit, Miami, Pittsburgh, Seattle, New York, Los Angeles, Portland and Cleveland show results similar to ours. It seems clear that this investment in our young children has significantly contributed to their social, emotional and academic growth and development.

As successful as these are, however, there remains a critical need for more early intervention, effective educational strategies, expanded parental, community, labor, business, university, social service and health care participation.

In a recent study conducted by the Council and the High Scope Corporation, it was found that the average urban school system with a poverty rate of about 30 percent was able to provide pre-Kindergarten services to only 23 percent of its kindergarten enrollments and that 70 percent of these urban preschool programs were able to operate only two or three hours a day. Of even greater concern is that, based on available data, the Council estimates that a poor child in the inner city is only half as likely to have access to preschool education and developmental help as a suburban child in wealthier circumstances. Thus, the child with the greatest need is also the one least likely to be served.

Our own need in Philadelphia is similar to that in the Nation generally and cities in particular, even though we have been in the forefront of this issue for many years. Our State does not require the provision of pre-kindergarten or kindergarten instruction and provides only limited subsidies for each.

Nearly all of what we accomplish in preschool child development is with an extraordinarily overstretched local budget, Title XX, or Head Start funds. Yet the unmet need is substantial and growing. Our poverty rate among preschool children is about twice the national average, and it is the link between that poverty and the developmental delays in the children that we see every day.

Mr. Chairman, without the help proposed by the "Community Collaborative for Early Childhood Development Act," thousands of children in Philadelphia alone will go to first grade many steps behind, with significant educational and developmental delays. Without the kind of intervention this bill allows, the multiple needs of these children will go unmet and unremedied until for many of them it will be too late.

Mr. Chairman, we believe strongly that Senate Bill 2270 can meet these crucial needs and provide a strong developmental foundation for our urban youth.

My written testimony further speaks to several of the passages in the bill; I leave that, due to time, for your reading.

Again, Mr. Chairman, the Council of the Great City Schools believes that this legislation has great promise for our young people. The Council and its member districts applaud your leadership in this crucial area. You may be assured that the Council of the Great City Schools will be working vigorously to assist you in passing this landmark bill.

Thank you and I would be happy to answer any questions the Committee may have.

[The full text of Ms. Clayton's prepared statement follows:]

THE COUNCIL OF THE GREAT CITY SCHOOLS
1413 K. Street, N.W., 4th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005 / (202) 371-0163

Albuquerque
Atlanta
Baltimore
Boston
Buffalo
Chicago
Cincinnati
Cleveland
Columbus
Dade County
Dallas
Dayton
Denver
Detroit
East Baton Rouge
Fresno
Houston
Indianapolis
Long Beach
Los Angeles
Memphis
Milwaukee
Minneapolis
Nashville
New Orleans
New York City
Norfolk
Oakland
Omaha
Philadelphia
Phoenix
Pittsburgh
Portland
Rochester
St. Louis
St. Paul
San Diego
San Francisco
Seattle
Toledo
Tucson
Tulsa
Washington, D.C.

Testimony
on
"Smart Start: The Community Collaborative for Early Childhood Development Act of 1988" (S.2270)

before the
Committee on Labor and Human Resources
U.S. Senate

Presented by
Dr. Constance Clayton, Superintendent
Philadelphia Public Schools

on behalf of
The Council of the Great City Schools

May 11, 1988
Washington, D.C.

Testimony on "Smart Start: The Community Collaborative for
Early Childhood Development Act of 1988" (S.2270)
before the
Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources
on behalf of
The Council of the Great City Schools

Mr. Chairman, my name is Constance Clayton. I am the Superintendent of Schools for the School District of Philadelphia and Co-Chair of the Legislative Standing Committee of the Council of the Great City Schools on whose behalf I appear today. I am pleased and honored to have this opportunity to testify this morning on "Smart Start" and to thank the Chair personally for his leadership in the crucial area of early childhood development.

Currently in its 32nd year, the Council of the Great City Schools is a national organization comprised of 45 of the nation's largest inner-city public school systems. Our Board of Directors is comprised of the Superintendent and one Board of Education member from each city, making the Council the only education group so constituted and the only one whose membership and purpose is solely urban.

The Council's membership serves nearly five million urban youngsters, or approximately 12% of the nation's public school enrollment. About one-third of the nation's Black children, 27% of the Hispanic children and 20% of the nation's Asian children are being educated in our schools. Almost one-third of these children come from families receiving public assistance.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Council of the Great City Schools, I strongly endorse S.2270, "The Community Collaborative for Early Childhood Development Act." The Council and its member districts pledge to work enthusiastically for passage of this important legislation. "Smart Start" provides the United States Congress an opportunity to enhance the life chances for millions of our inner-city youth by investing in their development early and comprehensively.

The benefits of early education are clear, considerable and lasting. Mr. Chairman, your own review of the Perry PreSchool Study underscores that preschool education has demonstrably positive effects on rates of high school graduation, post-secondary education, literacy, employment, welfare dependence and criminal involvement. Moreover, a recent report by the House Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, titled Opportunities for Success: Cost Effectiveness Programs for Children, 1988, reviewed 20 years of research and concluded that children who had the experience of early childhood education compared favorably with those who had not and exhibited a number of important characteristics such as:

- Improved student self-confidence, self-esteem and expectations;
- Increased school success;
- Increased employability;
- Reduced dependence on public assistance;
- Decreased criminal activity;

Our own experience in Philadelphia reflects those benefits. In addition to Philadelphia's historic contributions to the formation of our country, our local public schools have played a key role in shaping how our nation views the education of young children. The Philadelphia Public Schools were the first in the nation to introduce Kindergarten systemwide. We have had Kindergartens at every school site since 1887.

The School District has also offered a highly successful child care program for low to medium income children since the early 1940's. The mid-1950's saw the introduction of Parent Cooperative Nurseries which serve low to medium income families. And since the 1960's the school system has operated several of the largest in-school Headstart and Title XX programs in the country. More than 150,000 students in the city have received early childhood services since then.

Presently, our school system operates four major pre-school programs: Child Care, Get Set Day Care, Parent Cooperative Nurseries, and PreKindergarten Head Start. Our Child Care program serves 1400 children and youth ranging in age from 3 months to eleven years from 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM every weekday, twelve months a year, in 17 centers. A longitudinal study of these students over eight years from Kindergarten to Grade 8 indicates that by Grade 8 more than 80% equalled or exceeded national mathematics norms and about 67% equalled or exceeded national reading norms -- in comparison to only 40% for non-participating youngsters.

Our Get Set program serves 2,400 children ranging in age from 2 years to 11 years full day, full year, at 44 sites. A longitudinal study tracked them from Kindergarten to Grade 11 and found that 98% have equalled or exceeded national norms in mathematics and 82% in reading.

Similar results have been shown by our Parent Cooperative Nurseries which serve 440 pre-school children 10 months a year half-day and our PreKindergarten Head Start Program which serves 1700 three and four year olds all day for 10 months a year. In each case, longitudinal studies over nearly ten years show participating students at or above the national norm in reading and mathematics.

Studies conducted by our Department of Research and Evaluation credit these programs and other efforts with raising the district-wide achievement test score average above the national norm, reducing the number of students retained in grade, and decreasing the numbers of children assigned to Special Education classes.

Research on early childhood programs in Detroit, Miami, Pittsburgh, Seattle, New York, Los Angeles, Portland and Cleveland show results similar to ours. It seems clear that this investment in our young children has significantly contributed to their social, emotional and academic growth and development.

As successful as these are, however, there remains a critical need for more early intervention, effective educational strategies, expanded parental, community, labor, business, university, social service and health care participation.

In a recent study conducted by the Council and the High Scope Corporation, it was found that the average urban school system with a poverty rate of about 30% was able to provide pre-K services to only 23% of its kindergarten enrollments and that 70% of these urban preschool programs were able to operate only 2 or 3 hours a day. Of even greater concern is that, based on available data, the Council estimates that a poor child in the inner-city is only half as likely to have access to preschool education and developmental help as a suburban child in wealthier circumstances. Thus the child with the greatest need is also the one least likely to be served.

Our own need in Philadelphia is similar to that in the nation generally and cities in particular, even though we have been in the forefront of this issue for many years. Our state does not require the provision of prekindergarten or kindergarten instruction and provides only limited subsidies for each. Nearly all of what we accomplish in preschool child development is with an extraordinarily overstretched local budget, Title XX or Head Start. Yet the unmet need is substantial and growing. Our poverty rate among pre-school children is about twice the national average. And it is the link between that poverty and the developmental delays in the children that we see every day.

Mr. Chairman, without the help proposed by the "Community Collaborative for Early Childhood Development Act" thousands of children in Philadelphia alone will go to first grade many steps behind, with significant educational and developmental delays. Without the kind of intervention this bill allows, the multiple needs of these children will go unmet and unremedied until for many of them it will be too late.

Mr. Chairman, we believe strongly that S.2270 can meet these crucial needs and provide a strong developmental foundation for our urban youth.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to make a number of points about key features of the bill that we are particularly pleased with and areas we believe may warrant additional discussion, as the bill progresses.

1. Authorization Level: The Council is most pleased that the Chairman has drafted the bill to provide as much as $500 million in the first year, $750 million in the second and $1.0 billion thereafter. The scope of the national need for preschool programs demands a response of this magnitude.

2. Full-Day, Full-Year Programming: We are also pleased that the goal of the bill is to provide "widely available" full-day, full-year, services for our young people. Our own experience with such programming in Philadelphia is that full-day, year around services are necessary to be effective. The bill would be particularly

helpful to us in allowing Philadelphia to expand the number of slots already available on a year-round, full-day basis.

3. Poverty-Criteria: As a coalition of urban public school systems, the Council is also highly supportive of the bill's reservation of at least half of the program's slots for children residing in families with incomes below the poverty line. The national research is clear that preschool programs have the greatest benefit for poor youngsters who may be developmentally delayed.

4. Program Standards: The bill wisely establishes a set of national standards for programs under the Act. These standards are strongly supported by the Council as a way of guaranteeing program quality. The programming in our own school system easily meets those standards at a cost per child that is not significantly higher than other public and private service providers.

5. In-State Funding Formula: As currently drafted, S.2270 reserves 25% of the funds for state-discretionary purposes and distributes 75% to "localities" half on a per capita basis and half on a poverty count. Under this configuration, a city like Philadelphia would receive no more funds per child than a similar-sized county without nearly the poverty rate. Given the high levels of poverty in urban areas and the benefit that early childhood programs can have for poor children, we would urge the Committee to consider providing greater targeting.

6. Child Development Focus and Relation to Other Legislation: We are also pleased, Mr. Chairman, that S.2270 places its primary emhasis on child development and education rather than strictly on day care. Our own programs in Philadelphia have clearly shown that children who received developmental help early, rather than just day care, are more likely to be ready for school when they come of age. We are also

pleased that the bill leaves the decision for what is developmentally appropriate up to local authorities.

Because of its developmental focus, we believe that the new legislation is an excellent complement to its larger day-care oriented counterpart, ABC, which the Council has also endorsed. In addition, "Smart Start" will serve to supplement and expand the Headstart program. Some of "Smart Start's" funds, which can be used to expand as well as initiate services, would go for enhancing "Head Start" services in our schools. S.2270 would have then the fiscal and political benefit of providing an institutional anchor for Headstart, thereby increasing the constituency and funding for it.

7. Comprehensive Services: The Council is also pleased that the bill would authorize a full-range of comprehensive child-development services including education, nutrition, parent-involvement, prenatal, health and diagnostic services, day-care, home-visits and community outreach. The children who first come to our schools in Philadelphia are clearly in need of services in all areas of development.

8. Collaborative and Coordination: Another key feature of the bill requires collaboration in the delivery of services to preschool youth. In fact, this is the centerpiece of the bill. It is clear, Mr. Chairman, that neither the federal government nor any individual local entity, public or private, has all the resources and expertise needed to provide the services that this bill is attempting to do. Only through a collaboration of such entities in partnership with the family can it be done. We believe that this is important and critical for any national effort to be successful.

Collaboration is not easily mandated or achieved, however. We would urge the Committee to give additional thought to how large the local policy group is, who chooses its representatives, and what the boundaries of its authorities are. In a city as large as Philadelphia, political necessity could result in a policy group too large to function efficiently. An option for the Committee might be to restrict the size of policy group.

In addition, a number of groups are concerned about the governance authority of the local policy group. One option for the Committee to resolve this might be to model the responsibilities of the policy group after the Private Industry Council's (PIC's) in JTPA. In that case, the PIC's are not formal governing bodies but do exercise responsibility for oversight, policy guidance, planning and other activities. We would continue to vest decision-making authority in the Mayor, School Superintendent and Director of Social Services, with the policy group ensuring collaboration and coordination.

9. Definition of Locality: We also are most supportive of driving funds to the local level by formula to ensure stability and fairness. We would urge the Committee, however, to search for a tidier definition of "locality." The current definition could allow for overlapping jurisdictions to apply, thereby competing with one another for funds or control. While the bill has a provision for the Governor to resolve such disputes, we believe there may be additional room to discuss possible alternative approaches. Possible options for the Committee might include a definition of "locality" based on "general purpose units of government" similar to that in the old General Revenue Sharing Act, "service delivery areas" similar to JTPA -- with areas exceeding certain sizes always able to apply on their own, or on local

education agencies in Chapter 1 (ECIA).

10. Role of the Schools: Finally, we applaud the inclusion of schools in the provision of early childhood education -- if they desire to participate. Some school authorities are ready to take this step, others are not; some want them to take it, others do not. Clearly the schools have a valid role to play in preparing children for formal education because it is the schools that are held responsible for the final product.

We believe that these items are particularly crucial as the bill is debated and moves through the Committee towards passage. Again, Mr. Chairman, the Council of the Great City believes that this legislation has great promise for our young people. The Council and its member districts applaud your leadership in this crucial area; and you may be assured that the Council of Great City Schools will be working vigorously to assist you in passing this landmark bill.

Thank you and I would be happy to answer any questions the Committee may have.

The **Chairman**. Thank you very much, Ms. Clayton.

I remember very well speaking at your conference down here not long ago, when you were meeting in Washington and brought together many of your members from many of the different communities that are on your masthead here. We know the work that you do in many respects, some of the most challenging work in education—dealing with the problems of major urban communities.

In the last part of your testimony, you state with respect to the "Role of Schools": "We applaud the inclusion of schools in the provision of early childhood education—if they desire to participate. Some school authorities are ready to take this step, others are not; some want them to take it, others do not. Clearly, the schools have a valid role to play in preparing children for formal education because it is the schools that are held responsible for the final product." I think all of us would certainly agree.

You also point out that in your own communities that where you have the Head Start Program and other programs that are providing important services to the communities. What we have tried to do, is to emphasize the educational component but not exclude the opportunities for dealing through existing structures.

I asked Mr. Shanker questions about that, and clearly we are going to have to address it. We have attempted to address it in the legislation. I don't know whether you could comment about the way we have provided giving flexibility to communities to decide how services will be delivered, of course recognizing the significance and importance of the educational component.

How can you help us, given what you have seen on the firing line, so to speak, and knowing the different types of services provided through the education and in the human services department?

Ms. **Clayton**. Well, I would say we applaud the inclusion of schools in the provision, because in our city we think it is absolutely critical that these programs for early childhood development are seen as educational programs.

Senator Simon asked about the placement of Head Start. I would agree with Mr. Shanker that it belongs in the Department of Education. I think we send a clear message when we associate programs of this magnitude and this importance as being educational. And of course, the other comprehensive services which must accompany the educational dimensions are also very critical, because it has also been our finding that youngsters who come with poor nutrition and other types of social service deficits have their educational prospects and potential seriously impaired.

Senator Kennedy, you raised a question on what schools could offer, and I assume that also encompasses why we feel that it is important to have schools included in this particular landmark legislation.

First, we are able and I want you to understand that we have certified staff in all of our preschool centers. All of our teachers are trained. There is an ongoing staff development training program for our teachers as well as for the aides and support service people. So that is one thing. It offers an opportunity for continuity of instruction in that it enhances the articulation between pre-Kindergarten, Kindergarten, and grade one, which we see as a very positive benefit.

It gives us an opportunity for parental training. When it is included in school, it offers the opportunity for older siblings to accompany those youngsters into their preschool classes.

It also affords older children in the school to adopt some of the younger preschool students and engage in individualized support ~~and~~ supplemental instruction for those youngsters.

So the inclusion of programs of this nature in schools is absolutely a very, very positive benefit as we have seen it.

The Chairman. The Head Start Program in Philadelphia in the schools has worked well?

Ms. Clayton. Absolutely. We have some of the best data in the United States in terms of the success and the sustained success, which I think is important, for our youngsters.

The Chairman. The agencies have been able to work together.

Ms. Clayton. We do work together. We have a citywide PAC organization, and all of the Head Start centers send membership to that PAC organization, and those Head Start centers which are not operated by the School District also participate, and it is kind of an oversight governing advisory committee.

The Chairman. Thank you very much.

We want to welcome the Chairman of the Education Subcommittee, our good friend, the Senator from Rhode Island, Senator Pell, to our hearing this morning.

We will recognize Senator Simon.

Senator Simon. Before I ask a question of Ms. Clayton, I am going to have to leave for another meeting, and I regret I cannot stay for the testimony of Owen Butler and Herrick Roth. Herrick Roth happens to be a long-time friend. I don't believe I have met Mr. Butler before, but I have read the report of the Committee for Economic Development, and it is a superb document, and I commend you.

Dr. Clayton, your statistics that you give are impressive. You have four different preschool programs. This one indicates that by grade eight, more than 80 percent equalled or exceeded national math norms; 67 percent equalled or exceeded national reading norms, in comparison to only about 40 percent for nonparticipating youngsters. In another program, a longitudinal study tracked them from kindergarten to grade 11 and found that 98 percent equalled or exceeded national norms in mathematics, and 82 percent in reading.

Now, what you do not say here is, what percentage of the kids are you reaching in Philadelphia in these four programs that are outstanding.

Ms. Clayton. I am glad that you raise that question. Far too few. We have done some other surveys in our city, and just let me speak in terms of a geographic area of Philadelphia—North Philadelphia.

At one time, we were able to serve a combination of 3,000 children in that particular geographic area, a very destitute area, with many families well below the poverty level. In serving the 3,000, we found that there were 10,000 children who needed the service.

Senator Simon. So very roughly, would you say you are reaching 30 percent, then, using those statistics?

Ms. CLAYTON. No, I would not.

Senator SIMON. You are not?

Ms. CLAYTON. No.

Senator SIMON. Twenty-five percent?

Ms. CLAYTON. I would say more like 20 percent.

Senator SIMON. Twenty percent.

Now, if we pass this legislation, assuming the State government cooperates, what percentage will you be able to reach, do you think?

Ms. CLAYTON. It depends on how much of the funding would be able to come to a city like ours. Let me say this to you. Should this legislation pass, the Philadelphia School District has a commitment to early childhood education, a longstanding commitment, and as I indicated in my testimony, our funding for it—because it is not mandated in our State—comes from our operating budget. So, we are prepared to continue the matching and to continue increasing our funding for an area that we think is absolutely critical.

I am not really sure how many we would be able to reach. It would be contingent upon funding, space, and the availability of certified teachers, because we use certified teachers in our program.

The CHAIRMAN. Could I just interject. This is a voluntary program, as well, so we hope as many will use it as possible, but there may be some who choose not to for a period of time.

Ms. CLAYTON. We have very long waiting lists in our city, Senator, for this kind of service.

Senator SIMON. Yes, but my point is somehow—there is a fine line to draw here—you don't want to make the bill so good that it can't pass—and you can do that very easily here. On the other hand, we want to see that in Philadelphia, all those kids have the chance. And you can't provide an answer here today, but I would be interested in what kind of funding level—you get together with the financial people in your school district—we would have to have to see so that in Philadelphia we would reach not 20 percent of the kids, but 100 percent of the kids. And that's really what we ought to be talking about.

Ms. CLAYTON. That's right, and we will be very happy to supply you with that data.

Senator SIMON. All right. I thank you very, very much.

Ms. CLAYTON. Thank you very much.

Senator SIMON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And let me add my thanks to my old friend Al Shanker, too.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Pell?

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR PELL

Senator PELL. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to commend and congratulate you for directing our attention today to the very important issue of early childhood education. There is no question that it is a critical factor in securing the future educational success of our children. Intervention at the early stages of learning can often prevent real problems later on.

That is why we sought to target more effectively the educational needs of preschool children in the recent reauthorization of elementary and secondary education.

Most of the Chapter I Compensatory Education Program and the Head Start Programs have a longstanding proven record of success. The real flaw in these programs is that they are only able to serve a fraction of children who are eligible by formula for those services.

For example, the Chapter I Program, at a funding level of $4.3 billion, is only able to serve about 45 percent of the eligible children. The Head Start Program, at an appropriation level of $1.2 billion, is only able to serve 17 percent, or less than one-fifth of those youngsters who are eligible.

It is for this reason that, although I strongly favor efforts to promote this early childhood education, we must be very sure as we go along that we build on the already-proven successes of the programs in being. What we need here is a tremendous infusion of funds for this very good objective.

I would ask that my full statement be inserted in the record at this point, and I would also join in greeting my old friend, Mr. Shanker.

[The prepared statement of Senator Pell follows:]

STATEMENT OF SENATOR CLAIBORNE PELL (D,RI) AT THE LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES HEARING ON SMART START 5/11/88

I would like to start at the outset by commending the Chairman for directing our attention today toward early childhood education. There is no question that early childhood education is a critical factor in securing the future educational success of our children. Educational intervention at the early stages of learning can often prevent reading problems and other educational deficiencies in later years.

It is particularly important within the context of the changing demographics of our society, including a rise in the number of children born into poverty, an increase in the number of children who live in single-parent households and the growing trend of households where both parents work full-time.

That is why we sought to target more effectively the educational needs of pre-school children in our reauthorization of elementary and secondary education. This legislation, the Augustus F. Hawkins - Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988, was recently signed into law. I am happy to report that we were successful in that effort. The provisions of the reauthorization law explicitly indicate that Chapter 1 programs may reach children at the preschool level. In addition as part of this omnibus legislation we authorized the Even Start Program to provide grants for programs which combine education for disadvantaged students at the preschool level with literacy instruction for needy adults.

Both the Chapter I Compensatory Education Program and the Head Start Program have a long-standing proven record of success. The real flaw of these programs is that they are only able to serve a fraction of children who are eligible by formula for these services. For example, the Chapter 1 program at a funding level of $4.3 billion is only able to serve about 45% of eligible children. The Head Start Program at an appropriations level of $1.2 billion is only able to serve 17% of those who are eligible. It is for this reason that although I strongly favor efforts to promote early childhood education, I am very concerned that these efforts not diminish successful existing programs such as Head Start and Chapter 1.

I regret that I could not be here earlier, but I look forward to examining the testimony presented this morning.

The **Chairman**. Thank you very much, Senator Pell.

We recognize the strong commitment of the Chairman of our Education Subcommittee, as he has been a strong supporter of these programs over a long period of years, and we welcome both his involvement and leadership in trying to see the country address these problems in the future.

We want to thank our panel. Thank you very much, Al. It is good to be with you again. Constance, thank you very much, and my best to your Association.

Our final panel includes representatives of the business community, who will give us a different perspective on early childhood education. We welcome back Brad Butler, former Chairman of Procter & Gamble, who testified at a hearing in September following the release of the Committee for Economic Development's much-praised report called "Children in Need".

We want to thank you very much. We know you have got a time problem, but I think you deserve a great deal of commendation for taking on this extremely important area of need for our society, for our country, for our children, and really, for our future. I want to pay personal tribute for the work you have done and the availability that you have provided. We know you have travelled around this country and spoken on these issues in State legislatures or here at the national level. I think there is an increasing awareness and understanding of the message that you are bringing, and in no small part, it is due to your very important effort. So I want to thank you.

And Herrick Roth, we'll give you a good introduction later as an old friend, but I'm going to let Mr. Butler go ahead.

Mr. **Roth**. Please do. Thank you.

STATEMENTS OF OWEN B. BUTLER, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED, AND VICE-CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT; AND HERRICK ROTH, COORDINATING DIRECTOR, COLORADO FORUM

Mr. **Butler**. Thank you, Senator, and thank you for the opportunity to speak to your Committee here today.

Before you start the clock, I would simply like to say that after reading hundreds of attempts to summarize the early childhood development and education issue in the last few years, this six-page summary that someone on your committee has put together is the finest single statement on that subject that I have seen anywhere, and I hope you will permit me to plagiarize it heavily as I go around the country.

The **Chairman**. Right away. We do that regularly around here. [Laughter.]

Mr. **Butler**. But I will cite the source.

I have done a lot of travelling. I was in Senator Pell's State yesterday, as a matter of fact, working on a strong bipartisan effort between the Governor and the legislature to get their Rhode Island State programs started that will then be supplemented, I hope, by your bill.

As you know, for six years, I have spent practically all of my free time studying the manner in which we are preparing our young people to take their place in the world in which they are going to have to live and compete. In addition to chairing two subcommittees composed of business executives, teachers, school superintendents, professors and union leaders, I have visited 23 States, and I have met with countless individuals and groups working on this issue.

As a result of that study, I submit to you that nothing, absolutely nothing this country can do is more important to our future than the issues which are addressed in this legislation.

If we don't solve the problems you are addressing, we cannot balance our budget or our international trade; we cannot maintain a strong defense; and we cannot expect our Nation to be a peaceful and prosperous democracy in the 21st Century.

We have been blessed by nature and by the dedication and unselfishness of our ancestors with an abundance of land and natural resources, a free society, a free economy, and a wealth of productive resources. But our ability to capitalize on those blessings and to ensure for my grandchildren and yours a bountiful and peaceful life depends on our willingness and our determination to develop our most precious resource, our children.

Almost one million of the babies born in our Nation this year will be born to families living in poverty, and unless we dramatically alter the way in which those children are being nurtured, many of them will suffer not only from poverty but also from the racial discrimination which we have not yet abolished from our society, from the ravages of drugs, violence and neglect. They will themselves, in far too many instances, grow up to repeat that cycle of poverty and despair.

Because they will be unable to participate productively in our increasingly technological society, they will perpetuate a permanent under-class and will turn our Nation into the kind of two-class society where neither democracy nor domestic tranquility can survive.

Fortunately, however, we are blessed in two important ways. First, we have visionaries in our society who started 20 years ago to find the solutions to the problem of permanent poverty—programs such as the Perry Preschool Program, which has been cited here today, have demonstrated that the right kind of investment in the early years of children in poverty can dramatically improve the outcomes for them. Programs like the New Futures School in Albuquerque have demonstrated that teen parents can be rescued from the poverty into which they would otherwise fall and can raise their own children to be mentally and physically healthy and productive.

The Ysletta Preschool Program in El Paso, Texas has demonstrated that these pilot programs can be successfully duplicated within a public school on a large scale involving hundreds of children.

Second, we have the most generous population in the world—a people who are willing to make the necessary sacrifice to help those in need. My travels and my experiences have convinced me that the American people are not by any means tired of welfare. They are simply tired of welfare programs which don't work.

I am absolutely convinced that our Nation is ready to respond to your call for a major new investment in the welfare of our children.

I would urge you to consider two additions to your proposed legislation. First, let's face up to the increased investment we need to make in our children and propose the increased revenue required at the same time we propose the spending. Who is going to pay for it? Well, people like me should pay a major share. Thanks to the generosity and unselfishness of my parents' generation, I had the kind of public schooling which enabled me to prosper greatly in our free society. And there are lots of us—entrepreneurs, executives, financiers, professional athletes, entertainers, media stars and others—who are blessed with incomes which we can and should share more fully.

Just $1,000 each—just $1,000 each—from the wealthiest one percent of taxpayers would fund this program at the going rate of $1 billion per year.

Second, let's ask for some contribution from the parents of the children who will be served. Now, I don't mean we should ask them for money; it doesn't make much sense to give with one hand and take away with the other. What I do mean is that these parents, though poor, have talents and energy which they can contribute. They can help with the care of the facilities; they can help prepare the food for the children; they can help with the care of the children themselves under good supervision; they can help to make the materials that the children will be using in these schools.

They need to be asked for this kind of effort, not just to make the program less costly, but to make them part of the solution, to make them feel needed, to make their children see the value of their parents' talents.

We cannot and should not waste any of the talents in our society, and we should not let any member of this society feel that his or her talents aren't needed.

The individual States have already begun to move aggressively in the direction you propose. Your proposals, if adopted, will encourage all States to move and will greatly expand the programs in States and cities where movement has already begun.

I'd like to give you an example of that. In Ohio, it is illegal for any school district to spend any of its State or local funds on behalf of early childhood education. I think we'll get this legislation changed without your bill, but your bill would certainly ensure that that law would be changed quickly.

Every generation of Americans has the responsibility to make some sacrifice to keep us moving toward the American dream, the dream of a nation in which every child born or brought into the country has a truly equal opportunity to contribute and to benefit from its blessings.

We are blessed at this time with both peace and prosperity. There is no goal we could pursue which is more likely to ensure the continued blessings of peace and liberty for the next generation than the elimination of failure and despair among our neediest children.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Butler and response to a question submitted by Senator Kennedy follow:]

TESTIMONY
OF
OWEN B. BUTLER
RETIRED CHAIRMAN OF THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY
AND
VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

ON

SMART START

BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR
AND HUMAN RESOURCES

UNITED STATES SENATE

May 11, 1988

MR. CHAIRMAN:

My name is Owen B. Butler, and I am Vice-Chairman of the Committee for Economic Development, and Retired Chairman of the Procter & Gamble Company.

For those of you who are not familiar with CED, we are comprised of over 250 corporate and academic trustees who work together in subcommittees to study and evolve approaches to the nation's most pressing economic and social problems.

I appreciate the opportunity to testify on S. 2270, which is designed to extend high quality pre-school programing to 4 year-olds across the country.

As you know, as a 501(c)(3) the CED cannot endorse any specific legislative proposal. However, when asked, we can comment on whether or not the principles contained in a specific bill address a problem which we have determined, through independent research, has important economic implications for the nation.

Before commenting specifically on S. 2270, let me briefly describe our position on the need for quality pre-school education for the nation's children, and in particular for the educationally disadvantaged.

Generally, CED focuses its attention on macro-economic issues, national and international, and on such not altogether surprising subjects as our twin deficits; tax policy; third world economic development; risk management, and labor policy. But this past September we issued a major policy statement on the plight of our nation's poor children. Perhaps it is because we are a business group and normally involved in issues which traditionally concern business that this report has received such an extraordinary response.

The message of this recent policy statement, entitled Children in Need: Investment Strategies for the Educationally Disadvantaged, is best summarized in an editorial run by the New York Times at the time of its release. I have provided you with a copy of that editorial. Our point is easy to understand. The single most important investment that the nation can make for its future is to provide comprehensive pre-school preparation for every educationally and economically disadvantaged child in the country. We are convinced that this is an investment -- an expensive but profitable one. It is an investment opportunity which we simply cannot afford to pass up.

How did a group of more or less conservative-minded business leaders, not known for their enthusiastic support of governmental social programs, come to this conclusion?

The concern of the CED trustees had its roots in a 1983 study prepared on U.S. productivity and our worldwide competitive position. Like many other groups both inside and outside of the government the trustees had been devoting considerable attention to such issues as capital investment; speeding up the introduction of new technology; increasing U.S. savings for investment; and other steps to enhance our "tools" or "hardware" of production. But the further we looked into these as potential policy prescriptions the more the corporate executives involved became convinced that while the "tools" of production were important, the single most important contributor to productivity is people. We recognized that without a highly educated citizenry the "tools" would be in the hands of those who would not be prepared to use them.

A close look at the educational systems of other countries with faster rates of economic growth led us to conclude that our most serious shortcoming in developing the talents of our young people was not so much a lack of good colleges and universities as it was a failure to do as good a job as we should in the earlier years -- particularly in the traditional public school grades -- elementary through high school. With that thought in mind, we formed a subcommittee to examine U.S. public education with a goal of defining its relationship to economic success and developing recommendations for improvement in the system to improve our rate of economic growth.

In forming the subcommittee, we recognized that the conclusions of business executives alone would have little credibility on this subject, and so we expanded our group to include leaders from the world of education -- teachers, union officers, urban school superintendents, deans of teachers' colleges, state university chancellors, and others. We limited ourselves to issues on which we thought businessmen could make a unique contribution: defining the attributes required for employability; identifying opportunities for increasing education spending which would produce a clear and measurable long-term saving (or "profit") for the taxpayer; introducing business learning in the field of recruiting, training, management and motivation to the teacher work force; and compiling a list of successful business/school partnerships from around the country.

Although most business people on the subcommittee expected to concentrate primarily on high schools, we all agreed to look at the entire system because of the obvious importance of elementary school education to later success in high school.

Approaching this issue in the same way business executives would approach any serious problem, we spent the first two years defining the issues with as much precision as possible and commissioned careful academic research to give us the facts we needed to make sound recommendations. As a result, in 1985 we were able to agree on 89 recommendations which had the unanimous support of every subcommittee member -- business people and union officers, conservatives and liberals, men and women, blacks and whites. These recommendations are included in a statement entitled Investing in our Children: Business and the Schools. As you will note, the report covers a significant range of reforms, including: curricula recommendations; what we call the "invisible" curriculum -- the teaching of productive behavior and attitudes; standard setting; "bottoms up" policy development; investment strategies -- where the largest return can be found; the teaching profession; and management of the schools and the business role.

As the project progressed, sheer logic led us to look more and more at the early years. We also recognized that while all the reforms we were recommending might well improve the outcome for students willing and able to learn, they would only make it more difficult for those who were not prepared to benefit from school. It became obvious that "dropout prevention" programs which began during the high school years didn't work very well. The research we commissioned and the data we examined led us more and more to believe that in most cases, dropping out, illiteracy, and even teenage pregnancy and crime, were largely determined before high school age -- perhaps even before junior high school age.

From an economic viewpoint, we were frankly startled to learn that the single most profitable investment our society could make in education was not in the kindergarten through high school years, but rather in at least a year of very high-quality and expensive pre-school for disadvantaged children beginning at the age of three. At the beginning of our work, most of us were simply ignorant of the fact that this was not just a theory, but a thoroughly and scientifically tested conclusion based on more than twenty years of testing. After examining the nature of the test and the conclusions reached, we concluded that we knew enough to strongly endorse the institution of this kind of program for every disadvantaged child in the United States on the fastest practical timetable. We included that recommendation in our original policy statement in 1985, and it became one of the major points of difference between CED's policy statement and the numerous other recommendations about public education which were being made by other groups. Happily, this advice has not fallen on deaf ears, and the movement toward more universally available high-quality pre-school for disadvantaged children has gained a great deal of additional momentum during the last two years.

Having said this, it will come as no surprise that I view S. 2270 with considerable enthusiasm. As I understand it, the goal of this legislation is to provide high quality early education to children in the year before they enter the educational system, in most cases, when a child reaches the age of 4.

It is also my understanding that this proposal has been modeled in large measure on the Perry Pre-school program in Ypsilanti, Michigan. It was this very program, and the rigorous research which it conducted that led us to our strong belief in the importance of high quality pre-school.

Though modified from the Perry program, S. 2270 contains the fundamental prerequisites for successful pre-schooling:

1) a reduced child/adult ratio, with no more than 20 children in a class;

2) a professional staff trained in early childhood education and development;

3) full work day, full calendar year services;

4) direct participation of nutrition, health and other services;

5) a developmentally appropriate curriculum; and

6) parental involvement and outreach.

The fact is that high quality programing of this sort will be expensive, very expensive. We have received estimates that run as high as $6,000 per child for a fully enriched pre-school program with a parent/child ratio of 6-1. Clearly, this is beyond what the nation would be willing to do, but I do believe a quality program could be undertaken for approximately $4,000 per child. Making this program available to the estimated 815,000 age-4 children who fall below the poverty line would amount to $3.26 billion, an amount we need eventually to spend.

This bill is clearly designed to promote the concept of quality pre-school for all children. At the same time, the funds are distributed to enable families who cannot afford the cost to participate and to require parents who have the resources to pay their own way. This is a concept I also like, for it assures a mix of children and less chance for educational and sex stereotyping.

If I have any question about the bill, it is the reliability of federal funding to maintain these programs. Instances where states choose to participate, the federal government will pay 70 percent in the first year; 60 percent in the second; and 50 percent thereafter. When the states choose not to participate, and only localities become involved, the federal share will be as high as 80 percent in the first year, 75 percent in the second year and 70 percent thereafter.

I suggest you consider limiting the ongoing federal share to no more than 50 percent in all instances. These programs need to be viewed as evolving out of the community, with local control, and dependent in large measure upon local support.

History has shown that where federal government takes on too big a role and the federal funding is later reduced, many programs die. To address this problem I suggest you consider a clearly defined tax which is earmarked for funding this program.

A second concern is that this program would create an entirely new pre-school program in the Department of Education, when there already exists a one billion dollar Head Start program being administered out of the Department of Health and Human Services. Although there are clear differences between the design of the program outlined in S. 2270 and Head Start, it makes little sense to have two programs. Either Head Start should be redesigned or the billion dollars invested in that program should be invested in this one.

Even if this is done, and we enact S. 2270, we will have put into place only one element of what needs to be done to provide children in poverty with a real educational opportunity.

Despite our recognition of the economic value of a single year of high quality pre-school, we are left with a critically important question unanswered. If twenty years of comprehensive testing has proven that a single year of high quality pre-school can cut later dropout, illiteracy, pregnancy and crime rates for the affected group by somewhere between a third and a half, what other forms of early childhood support would have equally or more dramatic effects? Is it possible that we already know how to break the cycle of poverty which threatens not only our economic well-being, but our social and political health as well, and that we weren't acting because the knowledge hadn't been adequately communicated to the policy makers and the public?

This is the kind of question we should not duck. The CED did not. After conclusion of our first study, in which we recognized the value of high quality pre-school, we immediately convened a second subcommittee with similar but not identical membership to the first to address those questions. Our earlier work had convinced us that while many of the school reforms which were gaining broad support and implementation would significantly improve the educational results for the 70-75 percent of children who finish school, they would do very little to improve our success with the children who were "dropping out", or simply marking time in school.

Frankly, there were not a few among the trustees who viewed this aspect of our research with some skepticism. Several had overcome significant hardship of their own to "reach the top", having grown up in depression era families with barely sustainable resources and no welfare programs to speak of. They not too surprisingly surmised that if they had overcome these problems, why shouldn't this generation do the same? In short, if disadvantaged children don't make it out of poverty when given the chance at expensive public education, wasn't it their fault?

Despite these preconceptions, the CED subcommittee scoured the country to identify and evaluate programs dealing with every element of early childhood involvement as well as "dropout prevention" and "illiteracy prevention." What the committee learned first was that educational and societal failure was not the child's fault. We learned that money or the lack thereof does not really define whether or not a child is truly deprived. It is whether the child has the opportunity to be raised in a family where the parent or parents are literate, where drugs and alcohol do not exist, and where the child is nurtured, encouraged, disciplined, challenged mentally and physically and taught that it is their responsibility to do the very best they can at any assignment given. In short, the determining factor was whether or not the child had excellent "parenting". Also, added to that was the invariably healthy guidance from relatives, neighbors, church, and school -- all reinforcing the training at home, to which no cost can be ascribed.

It isn't lack of money that makes a child "disadvantaged" -- it's a lack of good parenting. But the two often are associated. Many children growing up in "poverty" households are in fact getting an excellent start from good parents, neighbors and relatives and they'll probably succeed somehow or other whether we give them special help or not. But many of the children in "poverty" households are getting grossly inadequate parenting. In some cases they have no parent, or they have parents or guardians who are themselves illiterate, or are addicted to drugs or alcohol. In some cases these problems have caused the poverty and in other cases poverty has caused the problems, but they are closely related.

What we also learned was that there indeed existed programs beyond the Perry School model which addressed the very needs of a child which good parenting normally provides but which these children were not receiving.

For example, we found:

- A $1.00 investment in pre-natal care saves $3.38 in the cost of care for low birthweight infants;
- $1.00 in children immunization saves $10.00 in later medical costs;
- $1.00 spent on pre-natal food supplement programs saves $3.00 in short-term hospital costs; and
- $1.00 spent on pre-school education can save $4.75 in later social costs.

We found programs, such as the New Futures School, which delivered these results.

From an economic standpoint alone, the nation can profit hugely by ensuring that these children get good parenting all the way, from adequate prenatal care through nurturing and preparation during the pre-school years to special help throughout the school years. Preventing the illiteracy, alcoholism, crime, and teenage pregnancy into which so many of them will otherwise fall, will save us far more in future taxes than the immediate cost of preventive programs.

I am encouraged that this Committee has taken on an important part of that challenge. It is a first step, and one we have to carefully design to assure its success. But there are others we will need to pursue. In our nation, twenty-five percent of the children under six are now living in poverty, and that percentage is growing. It is on their shoulders where much of our future will rest. Their failure may lead to our failure as well.

Thank you very much.

The New York Times
Founded in 1851
ADOLPH S. OCHS, Publisher 1896-1935
ARTHUR HAYS SULZBERGER, Publisher 1935-1961
ORVIL E. DRYFOOS, Publisher 1961-1963

ARTHUR OCHS SULZBERGER, Publisher
MAX FRANKEL, Executive Editor
ARTHUR GELB, Managing Editor
JAMES L. GREENFIELD, Assistant Managing Editor
WARREN HOGE, Assistant Managing Editor
JOHN M. LEE, Assistant Managing Editor
ALLAN M. SIEGAL, Assistant Managing Editor
JACK ROSENTHAL, Editorial Page Editor
LESLIE H. GELB, Deputy Editorial Page Editor
A. M. ROSENTHAL, Associate Editor
ARTHUR OCHS SULZBERGER JR., Assistant Publisher
LANCE R. PRIMIS, Exec. V.P., General Manager
RUSSELL T. LEWIS, Sr. V.P., Circulation
ERICH G. LINKER JR., Sr. V.P., Advertising
J. A. RIGGS JR., Sr. V.P., Operations
HOWARD BISHOW, V.P., Employee Relations
JOHN M. O'BRIEN, V.P., Controller
ELISE J. ROSS, V.P., Systems

For Children: A Fair Chance

Stop Wasting Lives, and Money

On Tuesday, a committee of business executives will publish a finding that could, over the next 16 years, change urban America. After decades of disappointment with anti-poverty programs, society is discovering that it knows how to do something that works:

Concentrate on helping poor children in their earliest months and years of life.

The business leaders, who joined with educators on a Committee for Economic Development research panel, are not usually aroused by issues like prenatal health or enriched pre-school education. But now they are; something's stirring in the political underbrush.

With presidential candidates already attracted to children's issues, this could be the season to seize the moment.

Save Three Children

Social welfare strategies have rolled in like waves. First it was housing, then services like social workers and clinics, then income strategies. None turned out to conquer poverty. Early childhood intervention won't do that, either. But instinct and social science affirm its powerful promise.

Cost-Effective Programs

WIC: Food for Women, Infants, Children	
Reduces infant mortality, increases birthweight. Participation: only a third of those eligible.	$1 spent on prenatal portion can save $3 in short-term hospital costs.
Prenatal Care	
Increases birthweight and reduces premature births in mothers who otherwise forgo prenatal care in the first trimester.	$1 investment saves $3.38 in the cost of care for low birthweight infants.
Medicaid	
Reduces neonatal and infant illness and abnormalities through Early Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment Services. In 1986, 2.1 million were screened.	$1 spent on comprehensive prenatal care for Medicaid recipients saves $2 in first-year care.
Childhood Immunization	
Reduces rubella, mumps, measles, polio, diptheria, tetanus and pertussis. In 1983 more than 3.4 million children were immunized under the program.	$1 spent on childhood immunization saves $10 in later medical costs.
Preschool Education	
Increases school success and employability and reduces dependence. Only 20 percent of those eligible participate in Head Start.	$1 spent on preschool education can save $4.75 in later social costs.

Source: House Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families

Consider the famous Perry Preschool Project in Ypsilanti, Mich. In the early 1960's, it began offering preschool to 3-year-olds from poor homes and with below-average I.Q.'s.

In a rare long-term study, researchers followed 123 children until their 19th birthdays. They did remarkably well. They graduated from high school and went on to jobs or more education at twice the rate of children without the additional early schooling. They also had fewer arrests, detentions and teen-age prenancies.

A year or two of early schooling so enhanced the children's confidence and sense of control that, as the researchers reported, their "better performance is visible to everyone."

All the more reason not to wait until a child is 3 or 4 years old. Why not start with prenatal care for frightened mothers, often children themselves? Why not provide classes in basic skills for fathers? An array of such services could save three children at once: The teen-age mother, her baby and the child she is persuaded to defer at least until she has finished school and gained both maturity and job skills.

Spend Where It Counts

Americans are generous about social welfare when they know it works, as with Head Start or food stamps. But they have learned to feel for their wallets when experts talk grandly about new schemes. Why should they react differently to early childhood intervention? Because it is known to work.

Strong evidence comes from the Perry Project. It cost $4,818 per child in 1981 dollars. But Ypsilanti recovered $3,100 almost immediately; the preschoolers required less remedial education and services. Other dividends have mounted as the years pass.

Another kind of arithmetic shows that early childhood intervention pays off. There were 240,000 low birthweight babies born in 1984. Hospital costs during the newborn period averaged $20,000. Complete prenatal and maternity care would have averaged about $3,300 — and probably would have produced healthier babies.

Experimental programs are already under way in several cities. One of the most ambitious is the Beethoven Project in Chicago's Robert Taylor Homes, the largest public housing project in the world. The program provides prenatal care and parenting education for expectant mothers, and eventually will offer developmental programs for infants and toddlers as well.

The idea is to deliver to the nearby Beethoven Elementary School in 1992 a class of kindergarten boys and girls physically, mentally, emotionally ready for school. If the experiment proves out, it will vindicate the conviction of the Committee for Economic Development panel that "improving the prospects for disadvantaged children is not an expense but an excellent investment."

From Abortion to Consensus

Attitudes about children have changed dramatically in the 16 years since then-President Nixon denounced then-Senator Mondale's developmental day care bill as something like Godless communism. Now, it's possible to identify and energize a potential coalition on behalf of early childhood intervention.

The issue engages basic and volatile issues like the sanctity of the family and parents' right to raise their children by their own best lights. Now, black churches have mobilized to help young women deal with illegitimate babies and minority parents respond to voluntary programs. Teen-age mothers need and want all the help they can get.

People on both sides of the abortion debate who care about family values join comfortably to promote early childhood measures. For instance, Representative Henry Hyde, the Illinois Republican who is a leader of the pro-life movement, sponsors legislation to give Federal health insurance to poor pregnant women.

Several Presidential hopefuls press for early childhood measures; New York City is already developing a program for school at 4. In Congress, the relevant Senate and House committees will conduct a rare joint hearing this week to consider early childhood legislation. Such a consensus is promising. To help children when help does the most good is an idea any citizen can appreciate. Likewise, the consequences of not helping children who lack a fair chance are also obvious.

Imagine a baby girl born into inner-city poverty today, to a teen-age mother. With an early childhood program, she'd be more likely to be born healthy; her mother could give her better care; and early schooling would enlarge her self-confidence. In 16 years, she'd probably be starting her last year in high school and have ambitions for the future. Without such a program, she's all too likely to have something else: a baby. And the heavy cycle will start again.

QUESTION FOR OWEN BUTLER

IN YOUR TESTIMONY BEFORE THE COMMITTEE, YOU SUGGESTED THE POSSIBILITY OF RAISING REVENUES TO PAY FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS THROUGH A FEDERAL TAX ON THE WEALTHIEST TAXPAYERS. COULD YOU ELABORATE ON THIS PROPOSAL?

I believe there are two appropriate ways to fund additional investment in disadvantaged children through higher taxes on the highest incomes and greatest wealth.

When Social Security taxes (and these are in fact a very regressive form of income tax) are combined with the very slight progressivity in current income tax rates, the tax rate on the wealthiest taxpayers like myself is almost exactly the same as it is on the lower middle income taxpayers. I think it would be entirely appropriate to ask taxpayers with incomes over about $150,000 to pay something closer to a 33% rate than the current 28%. I would feel much better about that higher tax if the revenues were sequestered for use only to increase investment in children and to reduce the deficit.

The second alternative (which I believe is almost Solomon-like in its equity but is much more difficult to administer) is to reduce the current annual "gift exclusion" from $10,000 per person to $5,000 per person and to apply a 20% tax on the second $5,000. These gifts are most often made to grandchildren, frequently to provide educational trust funds. Wouldn't it be equitable to say that if someone like me is going to give $10,000 to a grandchild that I should be willing to give $1,000 to a fund to provide similar benefits for our neediest children? I don't have data, but I'll bet that tax alone would be sufficient to fully fund the "Smart Start" program.

The **Chairman**. Excellent. Let me ask you about how we are addressing the allocation of responsibility at both the State and local level. We specifically wanted Smart Start to build on existing programs, not to be duplicative, and therefore we let flexibility at the local level determine what programs should be expanded. In some communities, it would be Head Start, in others it would be school-based preschool or other programs. No one model exists in every State and every locality, so rather than require a particular model, we left the choice to local discretion.

How important is this?

Mr. **Butler**. I think it is very important that there be enough latitude in your funding mechanism so that we can in fact build on what we have, rather than start a new set of programs alongside.

I would agree with several previous speakers that the degree to which we can bias that in favor of the school system without mandating it has a great many benefits. And one which hasn't been discussed here today is parent involvement. One of the ways you can think about this bill is as a "parenting" bill, and one of its great values can be to engage parents with the school system at the earliest possible stage of a child's life. And where these programs exist in schools, we have a much better chance that that parent will get involved with the school and will stay involved throughout the child's school life. So, bias in that direction.

I also would agree with what you have heard from several this morning that I would hope at some point the Head Start Program would be coordinated with this within the Department of Education, so that we have one Secretary in this Government responsible for child development.

The **Chairman**. I think you have stated very eloquently your own strong views for this program. Let me ask a broader question, speaking now for the business community. Why is this in their interest, beyond the very eloquent position that you have taken in terms of the whole issue of social justice--why don't we put on a different hat?

Mr. **Butler**. Let's put on the selfish hat, with which business is so often charged. I think businessmen, like everyone else, can be unselfish or selfish.

But selfishly, it is very simple. This is the best way in the world to reduce the cost of doing business in America in the long term, and businessmen have to be long-term oriented.

It does that first and simply because it will reduce our future tax burden. This investment in these children will return, as you, I think, said earlier, four to six dollars' profit on every dollar invested plus interest and inflation. It is a fantastic capital investment program. So it will reduce our tax costs in the future.

It will reduce our security costs in the future, because without this kind of program, our crime rate is going to continue to go up. Vandalism is going to continue to go up—all of the things which require wasteful expenditures. One of the big differences between this country and ours is that you are seven times more likely to be murdered in the United States than you are to be robbed in Japan.

We will reduce those costs. We will have a larger pool of talented, well-prepared, well-developed workers to come into our enterprises 20 years from now, and we will therefore run better enterprises, because in the final analysis, it isn't machines or technology that make a country run well and efficiently—it is people. And we'll have better people coming into our work force.

When we consider all the benefits, I don't know what the total economic return is. We know that in direct tax savings alone, it is four to five to one. Add in the other things, and it is probably in the range of ten to one. It is the way to make our nation competitive again.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Senator Pell?

Senator PELL. I would like to commend you for your own work, with which I am very familiar. As you know, more than 90 percent of the businesses have less than 50 employees; they are really small businesses. What do you see as the best way of encouraging not the big businesses, but the small businessmen, into participating in a program of this sort and become involved with early childhood education?

Mr. BUTLER. Senator, that effort is underway in a great many cities. The Chamber of Commerce in almost all cities is sponsoring an adopt-a-school program, which reaches a lot of small businesses. We have tried to reach 3,000 small businesses through the Independent Business Federation with the CED message. The fact is that the small businesses are the ones who benefit the most from solving this problem because they are typically the ones who cannot afford to run big internal training programs, and simply must have the schools, which give them talented people.

It is very much in their self-interest. They are not hard to convince. They are hard to reach. And we have a very strong outreach program, both directly and through the Chamber and local organizations, trying to get to them. But we have to keep working at it; it is a tough job.

Senator PELL. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. We want to thank you again very much for your presence here. It has been enormously valuable. I think we have had good testimony, and we'll conclude with Herrick Roth. But you have been very, very helpful, and your report, I think, has been of enormous value, I will just say as someone who is strongly committed to this program and bringing this message across the country. And we won't call on you too often, but we're going to call on you when we need you. This is excellent testimony and very valuable, and we want to thank you very, very much again for taking the time to be here.

Mr. BUTLER. Thank you. I thank you for what you and Senator Pell and your associates are doing to move our country forward.

The CHAIRMAN. Fine. Thank you very much.

It is a real pleasure to welcome Herrick Roth to this Committee. We welcome him most of all because of his continuing and ongoing commitment to a wide variety of different causes which our Committee is concerned with. Right now, he is the founder of Colorado Forum, a coalition of business enterprises across the State of Colorado, and we are interested in hearing from him about the views of the Forum as to how Smart Start will address the needs and concerns of the business community.

I must say I want to welcome him also as a long-time personal friend, a relationship that goes back how long—27, 28 years, Herrick?

Mr. ROTH. It was the night Martin Luther King was assassinated. You were in Denver.

The CHAIRMAN. It has been a long, long time. He has had a variety of different responsibilities in that period of time, always putting the interest and well-being of fellow citizens as his first priority. So we welcome him back as a person of very considerable credibility on many of the public policy issues on which he speaks.

Herrick, we are glad to have you back here.

Mr. ROTH. Thank you very much, Senator Kennedy and Senator Pell. I must say you are much too kind. I am very honored to be here.

It is the good fortune of the last 12 years of my life to have been working with business leaders. But my friend Al Shanker, whom I have known from the day he started teaching school in New York City, was here today. Al Shanker has met with the Colorado Forum and has cited part of our written testimony, which is a matter of record with you. Brad Butler got the business leaders who are in the Colorado Forum going, along with the first lady of our State, Bea Romer, who has been in this up to her neck, literally, for 25 years, but now that she is first lady, they are paying attention to her. So the business community is paying attention.

I am going to address this as quickly as I can, and I can see the clock and understand the time limitations, and then I will be glad to answer questions.

Several things have happened on the way to the Forum, as they say, and this is the Colorado Forum. One thing is that you asked a question a moment ago about business leaders, and why would they have an interest. You know, this is a cross-fertilization process. Business leaders have an interest because they are also being educated in the process as to the steps you go through to protect their investments in the future. But secondarily, the Colorado Forum is a business group, and they are CEOs only of major businesses in our State. They themselves have to participate, not their staff people. They have come to the realization that their greater benefit is to the communities in which they live, and therefore, they welcome the advent of this bill.

We are going through a process right now where not only will we be able to say, in my opinion, that we are 100 percent for this bill—we go through a unanimous consent process, where we take secret ballots, and 44 people have to say yes. They have already said yes, that we are going in this direction. They have already said yes, Herrick, please respond to the request to testify. And to come and be with Brad Butler, who really has been the leader—he and his wife have just been absolutely tremendous—I just have to say to you that this indicates the responsiveness of business leaders.

I just want to make two or three quick points, if I may.

Since three months ago in Colorado, in response to both the Governor's wife and the Colorado Forum, a bill was signed by the Governor yesterday that went through our legislature in a matter of about four weeks. That bill reaches, incidentally, one out of 30 four year-olds next year in half-day programs in every school district in the State, but approximately one out of ten who would be accessible in terms of the Head Start criteria. So you see, it is only beginning, and this is our first start.

This was not a response to pleas from the educational community. This was a response to pleas from the wife of the Governor and the leaders in the Colorado Forum. In other words, business accelerated this. So if you ask the question is business interested, you bet they are interested, and they will do considerably more.

We have set our focus on children. I have had a chance to talk with Brad for a while here this morning. In Ohio, he is putting the emphasis on parenting. We spent two hours discussing the background of your bill and of our interest in this with 38 of our 44 people present in one room for two hours, just a week ago today, and do you know what came up constantly? Parenting, parenting, parenting, and the parenting as a relationship. But our focus is children, because if you put focus on children and education, we decided, all other services inevitably gravitate to that point.

You can have child care forever; you will show by the statistics that you have and show that putting money in positions of poverty is an absolute necessity, because it does pay off; but when you start with education as the focus, which this bill does, and then tie the rest of it around it, I think we could probably answer the questions you have put this morning to both Brad Butler and Al Shanker in particular, yes, let's make this the coordinated center.

Talking about who is going to train these children—don't worry about it. If the members of your Committee would take the time, just like we did, in Washington, D.C.—and we had the Colorado Forum here on March 2nd—we spent a whole day visiting child education centers in this community to compare them with Denver. We have been through the Head Start centers. They are half public school, they are half child opportunity in Denver. They are independently operated here; they are also operated in the public schools—absolutely the most exciting kids whom you have ever seen, in which you always see the parents, many of whom are their teachers today. They are being taught by those who were the pregnant teenage women of 20 years ago, who had literally no education, but who now are teachers because they have been invigorated themselves to do it—which is part of the payoff that I think Brad is talking about.

We don't know what this investment is going to be, but if you don't invest now, we are really in trouble in the future.

My last comment that I want to make because I am watching the clock, and I have one minute—we have such a diversity of people in the Forum. Just let me mention—if I mention the name of Bill Coors, who's well-known across the country because of Coors Beer. I want you to know he is a gentleman like myself. He is in his 73rd year of life, and so am I. Why are we concerned about this? We are concerned for the general community purposes. But here is Bill Coors becoming a leader in this. Here is a gentleman of your age vintage by the name of Sam Gary, who is probably the most entrepreneurial but community-related independent oil producer in the whole of our Mountain States. He and Bill Coors have brought this literally to the Colorado Forum, but guess who is responding?

These are all people in the mid 40's age brackets. The chief person for Hewlett-Packard, the number two employer in our State and the second-largest Hewlett-Packard operation in the world is in Colorado—a young gentleman by the name of Bill Tippett. Manville Corporation has a relatively new CEO, Tom Stephens. Manville Corporation is headquartered in Denver. This is going to be one of their principal community projects. IBM has its key satellite center in Boulder, Colorado, which interacts with IBM Frankfurt in Germany. The gentleman who heads up that operation is going to chair our committee, Walt Price. They are all relatively young, at least from the perception of my vintage.

I guess what I'm trying to say is there is a cross-section of people from the ages of 40 to 70, and I must add, we now have an outstanding black in our membership of CEOs, AT&T having graciously assigned George Martin to Colorado to head up Marketing for the Mountain States. We have four women—it is very hard to find women at the top of corporations. And we have one Chicano, as we say—Hispanic, as most people say—who heads up the largest Spanish broadcasting network in the Mountain States.

Isn't it interesting, though, that those ethnic executives and others have come out of what are often described as poverty environments and they have made it. But, like Brad Butler, education was key to them. Because of parenting they understand where they came from and what this means for today's youngsters.

Now, if that's helpful, Senator Kennedy, I'll cease with that in view of the time.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Roth follows:]

Colorado Forum
Business leadership for Colorado's future

May 11, 1988

STATEMENT OF HERRICK S. ROTH

ON BEHALF OF THE COLORADO FORUM, OF WHICH HE IS A MEMBER AND COORDINATING DIRECTOR, AND HIMSELF, WHO RESIDES IN AND HEADQUARTERS HIS BUSINESS IN DENVER, COLORADO

BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE

regarding -- S. 2270

TO PROVIDE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES AND LOCALITIES FOR HIGH QUALITY EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS FOR PRE-KINDERGARTEN CHILDREN, or SHORT-TITLED as SMART START: THE COMMUNITY COLLABORATIVE FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1988

The COLORADO FORUM is a not-for-profit, non-political, unincorporated association of the chief executive or principal officers of the key business and professional firms in Colorado's private sector. Their names and a brief description of the purpose of the FORUM and the process which the FORUM utilizes are on the reverse side of this letterhead. The business leaders of the FORUM represent a diversified base of our State's principal economic sectors as well as a geographical representation which truly represents the intermix of our trade areas -- urban and rural; agriculture, manufacturing, mineral production, tourism, communications, law and services in all of our major river basins in both mountains and plains.

The COLORADO FORUM, since its inception nine and one-half years ago, has proceeded to address problems of growth and quality of life in our State in an effective manner because of a deliberate structural (as well as non-structural) design. The participants are the members, themselves, not their intergovernmental and public affairs staff.

c/o HSRA • 430 Writer Square • 1512 Larimer • Denver, Colorado 80202-1619 • (303) 573-6527

Members must be in regular attendance at monthly meetings or else a new member takes his/her place. Membership is limited to thirty-four individual firms and three out-State business leader consortiums. No more than three major public policy issues are on the program agenda so that the FORUM's attention can be focused rather than spread thinly across-the-board. All agreements must be unanimous for programs to be put on the agenda and conclusions reached as the respective programs are evaluated. Public advocacies (like this statement) are made when appropriate but the FORUM, itself, retains no professional advocate or lobbyist at any level of governmental policy concern.

The FORUM applies pre-mediation processes when meeting with adversaries in major public policy areas with the hope of finding "common ground" for such adversaries. If found, a strategy is proposed for the parties to pursue the solution required to solve the problems that run counter to the general community interest.

The FORUM has no officers and can deal with no client problems -- only public policy issues. The FORUM has a "sunrise". It must have unanimous consent to continue its existence from year to year or else it will terminate itself, automatically, any December 31st. Subject to that consent, the FORUM will extend into its eleventh year in July 1988.

Basis of Interest in S. 2270

You will note in the preceding background information that the COLORADO FORUM works on three public policy program areas, does so only by unanimous agreement of all its members and selects the three based on the most pressing private sector and community interest criteria relating to quality growth and development. For our ten years of operation, we have addressed only six program areas, having terminated or "spun off" four of these. Two are ongoing and are hands-on types of programs, namely world-class airport development in Denver and water resource development in the high country of Colorado.

One that we are now putting in a "continuing monitoring" status deals with the quality of and access to higher education among our thirty-three college and university insitutions in our State. As we have been changing the latter focus, we began in January of this year to examine the strong recommendations of many enlightened business leaders in this country with regard to early childhood development. The most prominent of those leaders is among those testifying here, today, Owen B. (Brad) Butler, who chaired the special committee of the Committee on Economic Development whose report has received the nationwide attention it deserves about "Children in Need".

To make certain that we could clearly define our own objectives if we were to make this one of our three program agendas for the months and two years immediately ahead, we sought out the briefings that we believed we would need.

We started with an extended dialogue with Mr. Butler, himself, and our entire membership. We continued by reviewing with Colorado's First Lady, Bea Romer, her own long standing work, dating back more than two decades, in early childhood education. Because Mrs. Romer, mother of seven children who have grown up understanding the importance of self worth, now resides in the Governor's Mansion in our State, she is "being listened to -- what a difference," she notes, "being First Lady means to my own commitments to children's needs." Over a year ago, she convinced the Governor that he had in his command some discretionary funding and also ways of reaching the business leadership. From that, she is the State's leading volunteer with a professional staff under the banner of "First Impressions". Bea Romer has a quiet but strong persuasiveness about her, especially with business and professional leaders. The COLORADO FORUM has been more than attentive to the priorities the Governor's wife is defining for both private and public sector support.

We will not mention here all of the first-hand visits some very busy and top flight CEOs in Colorado have been making, on site, in the past ninety days. We refer, here, to only three, because their impressions have been lasting.

(1) The Child Opportunity, Inc. programs which coordinate more than twelve different program and funding sources around the core of the Metropolitan Denver Head Start centers -- 40 of them serving over 1400 children, daily, but reaching what is estimated to be only 10% of the children and parents qualified to enroll in Head Start in Denver and our suburban counties. That's what the Federal funding provides -- in fact it is more than the Federal funding provides because other private sector and public funding sources from all levels of government supplement the ability of Child Opportunity, Inc. to extend the Federal Head Start dollars further. We could not help but ask, if Head Start funding permitted you to reach as many as 50% of the children who qualify, could you do it? Of course they could. And we

could not help but believe them. The commitment and teacher training programs they have in effect could be combined and accelerated as if they were ready to be mobilized to meet the emergency of a war declaration -- a war on the wasteland where children have no opportunity to be challenged without a Head Start and Child Opportunity, Inc.

(2) Thirty-two of our members spent an entire morning right here where you go to work each day in Washington, D. C. visiting children's opportunity centers. It was easy for Washington Teachers Union President Bill Simons to respond to our request that we visit both public and private centers for pre-kindergarten children in the District. When you meet a Mattie Jackson, one of the liveliest advocates of "look what children do when they find their own worth", you'll know why problems of teen-age pregnancies, child abuse and nourishing minds and bodies of youngsters from nursery school on up are solved by those who, now adults, have lived through those experiences and were given the opportunity to be trained in reversing their own paths of life and brought up to speed in how one teaches and provides care for the youngest of our children. That's what the privately operated National Child Day Care Association is doing here in the District. We visited one of its centers which was donated space by the public schools to attach its own program center to Shaw Junior High School.

(3) We then visited Takoma School to see a public school in operation -- a public school that operates full-day pre-kindergartens as well as nursery school services for parents who have toddlers who are related

to older children at Takoma. The parents, otherwise, might not have the opportunity to have their four and five year old children in school, because they have to work. The teachers, the paraprofessionals, the school support staff and the children share a spirit that any visiting adult -- particularly top-flight business leaders -- immediately catch upon stepping into the children's learning environment. The key on pre-kindergarten at Takoma is 20 to 22 students in a class with teacher and paraprofessional. The four year olds are so intent upon what they are doing, they are hardly distracted by seeing thirty-two persons infiltrate their learning spaces. When given the chance, however, to talk with the visitors and show them what they, the children are up to, the interaction is truly indescribable. Our business leaders were talking to themselves between bus stops with eagerness. We had just witnessed a brush with the future -- the work force entrants beginning in the year 2001.

Without expanding further, let it be said that we have met with the Under Secretary of Health and Human Services; with seven of the HHS key staff in family and children's services; with the Under Secretary of Education; with the President of the Children's Defense Fund (you know how challenging a Marian Edelman can be); with the President of the American Federation of Teachers (Albert Shanker is more than the second vice-president in seniority on the AFL-CIO Executive Council; he is a lecturer in the graduate school of education at Harvard; he is a provocator of school reform from the earliest years of a child's life); with Members of the Congress who are sponsoring S. 2270 and other key bills and programs; with the majority party leaders in our own state legislative body; with leaders of the Public Education

Coalition; with the Secretary of Labor (Ann McLaughlin is putting new credence to work in relation to both "Workforce 2000" and "Child Care -- a Workforce Issue"); and the list goes on.

On Wednesday, May 4th, one week ago, the COLORADO FORUM received the report of its Special Committee on Early Childhood Education and Care which endorses our unanimous agreement that at least through 1989, the FORUM will put its principal focus on "Colorado's Children". The report notes that early childhood education will be our focus. However, the report continues, everything central to developing (1) the language skills and (2) the self-worth of any child inevitably attracts all other aspects of that child's life into the conduit of his or her life, i. e., relationship with parent(s) and adults; with health and nourishment; with peers and community mores; with care and compassion. Therefore, as we begin our own focus on early childhood education, we already sense that we are looking at the whole child and how his or her development needs to be enhanced.

About S. 2270

From the start, you must be aware from what we have said that we will need your consent to continue to file additional testimony with you. Although we are committed to the purposes of S. 2270, as we read its contents, we want to be specific in support of its purpose and to make suggestions as these are approved in our own process, provided those suggestions are for the benefit of increasing the effectiveness of programs and structures you propose in the bill.

Today, in our general statements, we have these comments:

(1) There exists the most urgent of needs to augment the funding of a program long since proved but reaching far too few children and parents who are clearly eligible. That program is Head Start. That must not be neglected by the Congress, even as you make additional forward movement with other proposals.

(2) We have studied the "Children's Budget" of the Children's Defense Fund. We are in no position to doubt its validity. We see it as so highly defensible that you must not neglect moving S. 1885 (Act for Better Child Care Services of 1987(8)(9)(etc.).

(3) We like the purpose and commitment of S. 2270, which is before us here, today. While we sometimes shy away from adding another program --- one more element of daily government (often referred to as the bureaucracy of our life), we know that we would be in error to say that the bill should not go forward. After reviewing for your record some important demographics that we have not produced but one of the Nation's leading demographers has, let us state them here because they speak to this bill, the two preceding ones, and even S. 1995, the New School Child Care Demonstration Centers Act.

Demographics Support S. 2270

Thanks to his own leadership at the Institute for Educational Leadership located here in the District, Dr. Harold Hodgkinson is reaching the mainstream of community leaders throughout our Nation. His demographic expertise, not only in national and international terms but in relation to each of our States and Regions of the United States, is penetrating. Briefly, let us emphasize:

Head Start is a program that works and is working. It's a 7-to-1 payoff, today, up from the odds of 4-to-1 a decade ago. We pay for it now or we pay for the social services, the wasted minds and bodies, the correctional programs and the prisons in the future.

A profile of the twenty-seven million adults who have dropped out and are declared illiterate shows that they have no understanding about how the world works. Eighty percent of our prison population are high school dropouts. One prisoner in jail is the equivalent of SEVEN Head Start slots.

Genetics is no longer the field of argument. The question is when did the 9 year old first have the formal opportunity to learn. The basic reading levels when the child is nine is almost in direct proportion to early childhood opportunity to develop a mind and language skill. That's why today that 71% of the whites who are up-to-speed at the age of nine balances the number of whites who have had pre-school opportunity. Blacks match up 39% to 39%; Hispanics 44% to 44%; and so it goes.

Take a look at the workforce in the year 2220 -- its projected total components as compared with the 1988 workforce which is 70% "other Caucasian" (white) and 30% ethnic and national minority (Hispanic, Indian, Black and Asian Americans). In 2020, here's how it looks: White, 52%; Hispanic 18%; Black 24%; and Asian and Other: 6%.

Here's a fact of today. The New Rich in America are predominantly two parents working. The New Poor in America are predominantly single woman parents, working.

A Western Interstate Compact on Higher Education (WICHE) study just completed for the Southwest (Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, Arizona and Southern California) can shock you if you are willing to be shocked: that twenty years from now the new job entrants into the workforces of those States as defined here will be only 15% white male; will be more than 50% minority youth; and will be more predominantly women than men in terms of our 1988 workforce. These projections speak strongly: educate now for tomorrow's dividends!

What S. 2270 Says to Us

It encompasses children as whole people. It encompasses a multitude of factors that relate to how children grow up, even in the families whose parents both work and who need to have their children in educational and child care centers that are not simply baby sitting compounds.

We see the thrust of S. 2270 as speaking to our future. Children are politically neutral. There should be no political posturing in S. 2270.

We see these points of entry:

(1) For the cultural growth and community enrichment of our Nation, the port of entry is children upon their births.

(2) For the literacy, language and mathematical concepts which

this world increasingly demands, the port of entry is children.

(3) For the economic development and security of America, let alone the relationships of economic development to the world, the port of entry is children -- at the earliest possible age.

Even though some will not understand and still underscore that we are talking about "responsibility of parents" at early childhood ages, we happen to be talking about the same thing. Note the demographics - the family that is single parented and working; the family that is securing its upper middle class if not middle income status and is both parents at work. The responsibility of parents has not diminished; the logistics of where children are to be nurtured while parents are not at home with the children demand early childhood development programs.

One of the aspects of S. 2270 to which we want to speak in particular, today, is the genius that is developed at the local community level. There is every kind of living and working and poverty and well-to-do community in our land, today. But in every one of those communities, there are people who care and can lead and accept responsibility. Your Local Policy Group and the Local plan and application are key to the success of what you propose in S. 2270. If anything, you might redefine the membership to include a "review of the demographics of the local policy to be certain that the known and real leaders of the communities often overlooked within a locality are tapped and made a part of the Local Policy Group."

About Colorado: Let us say that the thrust of this Bill is being spoken to in new terms in Colorado. New leadership groups are coming to the fore. The COLORADO FORUM, among others, will be aiding and abetting the coalition that will inevitably be built, in fact very rapidly built in the next several months.

In January this year, probably no legislator was ready to introduce any bill that speaks to the objectives and incentives of S. 2270. Would you believe that last week House Bill 1331, introduced just a short two months ago, was passed through the Colorado House of Representatives with only a handful of dissenting votes? The House Majority and Minority leaders combined their efforts to have it passed. The Bill will establish for the first year a $1.5 million program for every school district to establish preschool programs for children in need of language development, with the support of the association of school boards that the funds will be matched in the 176 districts. Even as we testify, today, the State Senate of Colorado's 56th General Assembly is probably completing action to put this bill on the Governor's desk.

From the FORUM's point-of-view, this is a late start. But it speaks to how a non-political movement, beginning with First Lady Bea Romer and "First Impressions" is garnering support from every corner of our State to make up for lost time. We would like to say to you that you can expect the same kind of movement from all walks of life across America literally to demand of the Congress the support of every law and bill we have listed here, today. Our sense is that this would not have happened ten years ago, perhaps even as up-to-date as two or three years ago. But the business leadership of this Nation who profess to enlightenment about today and investing that enlightenment now in the product of tomorrow -- today's children whom we will not even see in the workforce until after 2000 -- is the soundest investment for every level of government in America to make. S. 2270 seems to state that Federal responsibility well.

Because of the impact of time, we will submit further statements to your Committee from time to time.

Respectfully submitted,

Herrick S. Roth

Herrick S. Roth

-- 30 --

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you, were they prepared to support the financial expenditures in the Colorado legislature as well?

Mr. ROTH. Absolutely. In fact, they asked for four times as many dollars as the legislature granted. The legislature granted $1.7 million; and we were asking literally for $7.5 million.

The CHAIRMAN. Is your program that you are developing out there similar to, or can you tell us how it might be different in terms of structure?

Mr. ROTH. It will be public schools only—in other words, it will definitely focus on the local school system. School authorities will be in charge of it because, in the haste of doing something in three weeks in the legislative process, you don't create new agencies. The State Department of Education, however, is supportive. And teacher groups have responded.

The CHAIRMAN. How are they going to relate to the Head Start Programs out there?

Mr. ROTH. That is not written into the bill. What we are doing is that we want to get something started by July 1. We want to get a commitment on the books. We want legislators to respond as they seek re-election, and 83 of the 100 are—and incidentally, we have given them the Children's Defense League poster—you have seen the one about the politician who just loves the babies and is looking at the TV camera while he is kissing the baby kind of stuff——

The CHAIRMAN. Do they do that out in Colorado?

Mr. ROTH. Yes, you know this; you have been to Colorado a lot. But anyway, to make a long story short, we have given that to every legislator saying, "Just remember this in your campaign, because the children are in focus."

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I commend you for the efforts that have been made. We are going to see programs developed in the States, and obviously, that is important. But as was said, I think, by Evelyn Murphy, we are looking at a real partnership with the Federal government and the State and the parents and the community and the local kinds of business groups that want to involve themselves; they are going to have an extremely important role as well in the fashioning and the shaping of the child care and day care programs. I think it has to be a real national effort.

Mr. ROTH. I will tell you, there has to be a Federal presence.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we have been reminded of that, and there are going to be important responsibilities for all of us in this.

I want to thank you very much, Herrick. I hope you would be good enough to keep us posted as to that program, how it is working, the success of it. We would appreciate it if you would let those who are involved in the program know what we are doing as well. We need to get support for this program across the country, and we certainly welcome their suggestions.

We are going to leave the record open for questions of some of the witnesses and for written statements.

The Committee will stand in recess.

Thank you very much.

[Whereupon, at 12:15 p.m., the Committee was adjourned.]

SMART START: THE COMMUNITY COLLABORATIVE FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1988

FRIDAY, JUNE 10, 1988

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 8:05 a.m., in room 430, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Edward M. Kennedy (Chairman) presiding.

Present Senators Kennedy and Dodd.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR KENNEDY

The CHAIRMAN. Good morning. We will come to order. I want to, at the outset, express my sincere appreciation to all of our witnesses this morning for making adjustments in their schedules. I'm sure you understand that we are guided strongly by the schedule of the Senate itself. I have a very direct interest in the measure which is up before the Senate today—and that is the death penalty legislation. This has made it necessary for us to adjust the timing of this hearing. I am indeed grateful to all of you who, have been willing to make an accommodation.

We want to welcome all of our distinguished witnesses here this morning for our third hearing on S. 2770, Smart Start: The Community Collaborative for Early Childhood Development Act. We send a particularly warm welcome to some of the students who will be joining us. We will do the best that we possibly can to ensure future opportunity for them and for the rest of the children of this country.

This is our third hearing on the critical issue on early childhood development. Thus far, we have heard from a series of distinguished witnesses representing a wide range of organizations interested in this issue, including governors—both Democrats and Republicans from across the country—civil rights groups, teachers, school districts, and the business community. Today we will hear from education organizations, parents' organizations, children's groups, and from early childhood programs with a proven record of success.

We are grateful for the opportunity to hear from this broad range of interests and are using the opportunity to solicit suggestions for changes in the legislation to get it ready for action early next year. We also support the ABC child care bill, and look forward to being able to take legislative action on that bill this year.

We strongly believe that together ABC and Smart Start will go a long way towards addressing the increased need for services for young children in this country.

We need high quality child care for children from birth through after-school care for elementary school-age youngsters. Increasing numbers of women with young children are entering the work force and facing the often futile struggle of finding a safe, affordable place to leave their children. The ABC bill will address this.

We also need to ensure that all children have access to high quality early childhood development programs before they enter elementary school. We know that these programs work, not just in the short term, but that they have a profound and lasting impact on the lives of their graduates in their adult years. We will hear today from several programs which can point to such success: the Federal Head Start program which is celebrating its 20th year of operation; the High Scope Foundation which has tracked Perry Preschool participants in Ypsilanti, Michigan, and whose curriculum has been adopted by other programs around the country; and the Brookline Early Education Project in Massachusetts.

It is high quality programs like these which, through this legislation, we hope to make available to every child whose parents want them to participate. Such programs would follow minimum standards consistent with high quality, and would run for the full work day and full calendar year to meet the needs of working parents as well. Funds would be made available to build on programs such as those we will hear from today so that they could extend their hours to run all day.

Where necessary, funds could be used to upgrade programs by lowering child-adult ratios or group size, by training staff in early childhood development, by providing health, nutrition and other social services to children and their families, by ensuring active parental involvement, by renovating facilities to make them suitable for use as children's centers, and to increase staff salaries and reduce turnover. And where no programs exist, funds would be available to establish them, by involving all those interested at the state and local levels in serving this age group of youngsters.

We are committed to moving this legislation early next year. We welcome the testimony we will hear today and thank everyone here for joining us.

[The prepared statement of Senator Kennedy follows:]

STATEMENT OF SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY
LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE HEARING ON SMART START

I WANT TO WELCOME ALL OF OUR DISTINGUISHED WITNESSES HERE THIS MORNING FOR OUR THIRD HEARING ON S. 2270, 'SMART START: THE COMMUNITY COLLABORATIVE FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT ACT'. WE SEND A PARTICULARLY WARM WELCOME TO THE STUDENTS FROM DIANE CINI'S CLASS AT FAIRFAX COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY ACTION HEAD START. I AM GRATEFUL TO SHARON GLYNN, SANDRA LOWE, AND SANDRA SCOTT FORREST FOR ARRANGING FOR THEM TO JOIN US TODAY. WE HAVE HIGH HOPES THAT YOUNGSTERS ACROSS THE COUNTRY LIKE THESE CHILDREN WILL BENEFIT FROM THIS LEGISLATION.

I AM ESPECIALLY GLAD TO HAVE OUR YOUNG VISITORS WITH US TODAY, BECAUSE THEY BRING SPECIAL MEANING TO THE FOCUS OF TODAY'S HEARING: WHAT WE CAN DO TO PROVIDE THE BEST POSSIBLE OPPORTUNITIES FOR OUR NATION'S CHILDREN. THIS IS OUR THIRD HEARING ON THE CRITICAL ISSUE OF EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT. THUS FAR, WE HAVE HEARD FROM A SERIES OF DISTINGUISHED WITNESSES REPRESENTING A WIDE RANGE OF ORGANIZATIONS INTERESTED IN THIS ISSUE, INCLUDING GOVERNORS -- BOTH DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS FROM AROUND THE COUNTRY -- CIVIL RIGHTS GROUPS, TEACHERS, SCHOOL DISTRICTS, AND THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY. TODAY WE WILL HEAR FROM EDUCATION ORGANIZATIONS, PARENTS ORGANIZATIONS, CHILDREN'S GROUPS, AND FROM EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS WITH A PROVEN RECORD OF SUCCESS.

WE ARE GRATEFUL FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO HEAR FROM THIS BROAD RANGE OF INTERESTS AND ARE USING THE OPPORTUNITY TO SOLICIT SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGES IN THE LEGISLATION TO GET IT READY FOR ACTION EARLY NEXT YEAR. WE ARE ALSO VERY SUPPORTIVE OF THE A.B.C. CHILD CARE BILL, AND LOOK FORWARD TO BEING ABLE TO TAKE LEGISLATIVE ACTION ON THAT BILL THIS YEAR. WE STRONGLY BELIEVE THAT TOGETHER, THE A.B.C. BILL AND SMART START WILL GO A LONG WAY TOWARD ADDRESSING THE INCREASING NEED FOR SERVICES FOR YOUNG CHILDREN IN THIS COUNTRY.

WE NEED HIGH QUALITY CHILD CARE FOR CHILDREN FROM BIRTH THROUGH AFTER-SCHOOL CARE FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL-AGE YOUNGSTERS, BECAUSE INCREASING NUMBERS OF WOMEN WITH YOUNG CHILDREN ARE ENTERING THE WORKPLACE AND FACING THE OFTEN FUTILE STRUGGLE OF FINDING A SAFE AFFORDABLE PLACE TO LEAVE THEIR CHILDREN. THE A.B.C. BILL WILL ADDRESS THIS. WE ALSO NEED TO ENSURE THAT ALL CHILDREN HAVE ACCESS TO HIGH QUALITY EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS BEFORE THEY ENTER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL. WE KNOW THAT THESE PROGRAMS WORK, NOT JUST IN THE SHORT TERM, BUT THAT THEY HAVE A PROFOUND AND LASTING IMPACT ON THE LIVES OF THEIR GRADUATES INTO THEIR ADULT YEARS. WE WILL HEAR TODAY FROM SEVERAL PROGRAMS WHICH CAN POINT TO SUCH SUCCESS: THE FEDERAL HEAD START PROGRAM WHICH IS CELEBRATING IT'S 20TH YEAR OF OPERATION; THE HIGH SCOPE FOUNDATION WHICH HAS TRACKED PERRY PRE-SCHOOL PARTICIPANTS IN YPSILANTI, MICHIGAN, AND WHOSE CURRICULUM HAS BEEN ADOPTED BY OTHER PROGRAMS AROUND THE COUNTY; AND THE BROOKLINE EARLY EDUCATION PROJECT IN MASSACHUSETTS.

IT IS HIGH QUALITY PROGRAMS LIKE THESE WHICH, THROUGH THIS LEGISLATION, WE HOPE TO MAKE AVAILABLE TO EVERY CHILD WHOSE PARENTS WANT THEM TO PARTICIPATE. SUCH PROGRAMS WOULD FOLLOW MINIMUM STANDARDS CONSISTENT WITH HIGH QUALITY, AND WOULD RUN FOR THE FULL WORK-DAY AND FULL CALENDAR YEAR TO MEET THE NEEDS OF WORKING PARENTS AS WELL. FUNDS WOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE TO BUILD ON PROGRAMS SUCH AS THOSE WE WILL HEAR FROM TODAY SO THAT THEY COULD EXTEND THEIR HOURS TO RUN ALL DAY. WHERE NECESSARY, FUNDS COULD BE USED TO UPGRADE PROGRAMS BY LOWERING CHILD-ADULT RATIOS OR GROUP SIZE, BY TRAINING STAFF IN EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT, BY PROVIDING HEALTH, NUTRITION AND OTHER SOCIAL SERVICES TO CHILDREN AND THEIR FAMILIES, BY ENSURING ACTIVE PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT, BY RENOVATING FACILITIES TO MAKE THEM SUITABLE FOR USE AS CHILDREN'S CENTERS, AND TO INCREASE STAFF SALARIES AND REDUCE TURNOVER. AND WHERE NO PROGRAMS EXIST, FUNDS WOULD BE AVAILABLE TO ESTABLISH THEM, BY INVOLVING ALL THOSE INTERESTED AT THE STATE AND LOCAL LEVELS IN SERVING THIS AGE-GROUP OF YOUNGSTERS.

WE ARE COMMITTED TO MOVING THIS LEGISLATION EARLY NEXT YEAR. WE WELCOME THE TESTIMONY WE WILL HEAR TODAY AND THANK EVERYONE HERE FOR JOINING US.

The CHAIRMAN. We will ask Mr. Arturo Vargas if he would be good enough to come forward. Mr. Vargas is the senior education policy analyst at the National Council of La Raza. We have worked with La Raza most recently in the reauthorization of the bilingual program. We are very pleased that Mr. Vargas could be with us today to talk about early childhood education.

Evelyn Moore is the director of the National Black Child Development Institute. She was also a teacher in the original Perry Preschool in Michigan. I hope she will share some of her teaching experiences with us. We hear so much about the Perry program and the difference it made in children's lives. Here is one of the people responsible for those tremendous results.

Dr. Carolyn Cobb is coordinator of School Psychological Services, State of North Carolina. She will testify on behalf of the National Alliance of Pupil Services Organizations, who have been very helpful to us as we work on the Smart Start legislation. Dr. Cobb is joined by Isadora Hare, the staff director of the Commission on Education of the National Association of Social Workers. We are very pleased to have Dr. Cobb and Ms. Hare with us today.

Mr. Vargas, we will start off with you.

STATEMENT OF ARTURO VARGAS, SENIOR EDUCATION POLICY ANALYST, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF LA RAZA, WASHINGTON, DC

Mr. VARGAS. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. My name is Arturo Vargas. I am the Senior Education Policy Analyst with the National Council of La Raza, one of the largest national Hispanic organizations. Let me first express the personal regrets of Mr. Raul Yzaguirre, the president of the Council, who very much wanted to be here this morning but because of a previous commitment could not. We appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today to express our views on S. 2270, the Smart Start Act, Community Collaborative for Early Childhood Development Act of 1988.

Education is perhaps the single most important issue for Hispanics. It always tops the list of concerns in surveys of the Hispanic community. There is little wonder why this is so. A larger proportion of Hispanics than either Whites or Blacks are either in school, should be in school, are about to enter school, or have children of school age. Hispanics are also the most undereducated U.S. population group, experiencing a cycle of undereducation that begins in the earliest grades.

In addition, there is an acute shortage of high quality early childhood education programs and child care services to meet the needs of low income working parents. Any initiative that concerns children, and certainly almost every education initiative, disproportionately affects the Hispanic community. This is why the Smart Start Act of 1988 is of particular interest to the National Council of La Raza and its national network. No other major population group will be more affected by Smart Start than the Hispanic community.

A demographic profile of the Hispanic community shows why Smart Start is of particular interest. Of the more than 6.1 million Hispanic children under the age of 18 in 1987, nearly one-third of them were under the age of five. In 1986, more than one out of every ten Hispanics was a child under the age of five; a proportion higher than for Blacks or Whites. Because the Hispanic fertility rate is still well above replacement levels, and higher than for Whites or Blacks, we can expect large cohorts of children in the immediate future.

In 1987, almost three-fourths of Hispanic children were living with both parents and almost half of these had mothers who worked outside the home. The proportion of Hispanic women in the work force has increased from 40 percent to 50 percent in the last 15 years, and is expected to continue to increase at a rapid rate. These data indicate that the need for high quality, affordable child care and early childhood education programs will need also to increase rapidly in coming years.

Affordability is a major concern. Hispanics, especially Hispanic women, are currently concentrated in low-skill, low-paid position. Hispanic family income registered no substantial gains during the first half of this decade, and the gap between Hispanic and White family income has been widening for 15 years. The number of Hispanic families below the poverty level in 1986 was 24 percent higher than in 1981; nearly one-fourth of Hispanic families were poor in 1986.

In that same year, almost one-fourth of Hispanic origin families were headed by women, and more than half of these lived below the poverty level. Two out of three Hispanic children in female-headed households lived in poverty, as did 37 percent of all Hispanic children. Poor families cannot afford to purchase high quality child care, and yet the lack of available care contributes to their continued poverty.

Hispanics are also the most undereducated major population group, completing less years of schooling and having higher rates of illiteracy than either Whites or Blacks. Being enrolled below grade level, usually caused by failing a grade and being kept back to repeat it, has been shown to be perhaps the greatest predictor of a child's later dropping out of school. The percentage of Hispanic children enrolled below grade level increases steadily and is alarming higher than for Whites.

More than one out of every four Hispanic children in grades one through four is already at least one grade below grade level. We are talking about children who "fail" kindergarten or "fail" first grade and are held behind. A child who is held behind one year, his or her chances of dropping out of school increases by 50 percent; being held back two years increases that child's likelihood of dropping out of school by 90 percent.

Early intervention programs are needed to prevent this early school failure. This problem affects both English-proficient and limited-English proficient Hispanic children. However, limited-English proficient children are at higher risk of early school failure, and this population will increase in the near future. The number of Spanish-language background children alone is expected to increase by 55 percent by the year 2000.

A substantial number of Hispanics are at risk of early school failure, dropping out, or both. Studies have shown that early childhood education programs can reduce many of the causes of early school failure and dropping out. In order to keep Hispanic children traveling successfully through the education pipeline, programs such as those provided in Smart Start are essential.

Recognizing this need, the National Council of La Raza is currently engaged in a national demonstration program of five low-cost, community-based education interventions designed to increase Hispanic school success. One is targeted at the earliest grades and one is targeted at parents.

While the National Council of La Raza supports the overall thrust of Smart Start, we believe that some refinements are needed to strengthen the program's ability to serve Hispanic children. Allow me first to mention that we strongly support the 50 percent reservation for children who come from families who make up to 115 percent of the poverty level, and the minimum standards required by Section 16.

The Council supports the current references for services to limited-English proficient children, but believes that some of the provisions should be strengthened. The legislation stresses that the programs funded under this act must be appropriate for the child's age and all areas of the individual child's development. The requirement for developmentally appropriate programs is especially important for programs that serve these children.

These programs must be staffed by personnel trained in second language acquisition methods and multi-cultural education as well as early childhood education. It would be a tragedy if, instead of providing limited-English proficient children with a smart start in the early school years, programs funded under this act were to provide these children with an early start in school failure because of inappropriate language programs.

Unless the number of early childhood education personnel who are trained in serving limited-English proficient children is increased, programs funded under this act will not be able to appropriately serve this population. The training provisions of the Smart Start Act should be strengthened to encourage the recruitment of bilingual personnel and provide training for existing personnel in second language acquisition and multi-cultural education.

In terms of parent involvement, the National Council of La Raza believes that parent involvement must be a fundamental component of any school curriculum. Programs should have outreach workers who are familiar with the needs of Hispanic families; and this includes bilingual personnel where needed. It is critical that early childhood education programs communicate with parents in a language and form that the parents understand.

In terms of the state task force and local policy group, these bodies are important in the administration, implementation, and evaluation of this program. The bill mentions that both these groups shall be balanced according to race, ethnicity and gender. We believe the current language is too vague because it does not ensure the full representation of Hispanics and other minorities. We recommend that the composition of these bodies be required to reflect the racial and ethnic composition of the affected populations.

The National Council of La Raza strongly supports the role of community-based organizations as service providers in this program, and believes the role of these entities in its governance should be strengthened. Often these entities are the most effective in delivering services to the Hispanic community. In order to help ensure proper service delivery, we recommend that community-based organizations be assured full representation on the local policy group.

Data collection requirements should specify the collection of information on the race and ethnicity of all children receiving services and the children on waiting lists. The legislation currently requires that data on socioeconomic background of these children be collected. These statistics do not always include data on race and ethnicity. Such data are important for determining if Hispanic and other minority children are adequately served, relative to need, assessing outreach efforts, and evaluating the effectiveness of the program's educational component.

Since Hispanics are the youngest and most undereducated major population group, it is critical that Smart Start recognize and respond to these needs. This legislation, along with other measures introduced in the 100th Congress, is important because it has the potential of preventing early enrollment below grade level, lowering the dropout rate, and ultimately improving the educational attainment of Hispanics overall. The economic success of the Hispanic community, and indeed of our whole society, in the future depends on our ability to provide appropriate, high quality education to Hispanic children today.

The National Council of La Raza appreciates the opportunity to present our views to you, Mr. Chairman, and we appreciate your leadership in this field. As always, we stand ready to assist your committee in any way possible to assure that this legislation is strengthened, enacted, and effectively implemented.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Vargas follows:]

TESTIMONY ON

SMART START: THE COMMUNITY COLLABORATIVE FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1988

Presented by

Arturo Vargas
Senior Education Policy Analyst
National Council of La Raza

Before the
Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources

June 10, 1988

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF LA RAZA
Raul Yzaguirre
President
Number 20 F Street, N.W.
Second Floor
Washington, D.C. 20001

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF LA RAZA

I. INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, my name is Arturo Vargas and I am the Senior Education Policy Analyst at the National Council of La Raza, one of the largest national Hispanic organizations. The National Council of La Raza exists to improve life opportunities for Americans of Hispanic descent and is a private, nonprofit organization representing over 80 local Hispanic community-based organizations serving 32 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia. I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you to express our views on S. 2270, "Smart Start: The Community Collaborative for Early Childhood Development Act of 1988."

Education is perhaps the single most important issue for Hispanics; it almost always tops the list of concerns in surveys of the Hispanic community. There is little wonder why this is so. A larger proportion of Hispanics than either Whites or Blacks are either in school, should be in school, are about to enter school, or have children of school age. Hispanics are also the most undereducated major U.S. population group, experiencing a cycle of undereducation that begins in the earliest grades. In addition, there is an acute shortage of high quality early childhood education programs and child care services to meet the needs of low-income working parents. Any initiative that concerns children, and certainly almost every education initiative, disproportionately affects the Hispanic community. This is why the "Smart Start Act of 1988" is of particular interest to the National Council of La Raza and its national network. No major population group would be more affected by "Smart Start" than the Hispanic community.

II. HISPANIC DEMOGRAPHICS

Hispanics are a growing population. Census data for March 1987 showed that the Hispanic population had increased by 30% since 1980, a growth rate about five times that of the rest of the U.S. population. In March 1987, Hispanics comprised 7.9% of the total U.S. population, compared to 6.8% in 1982.

The fertility rate of Hispanic women has declined slightly during this decade, but is still higher than that of White or Black women. In 1986, the overall U.S. fertility rate was 70.3 births per 1,000 women 18 to 44 years old, compared to 105.6 births per 1,000 Hispanic women in that age group. Approximately 12% of all births in June 1986 were to Hispanic women. We can expect large cohorts of children in the immediate future since the Hispanic fertility rate is still well above "replacement" levels.

Hispanics are by far the youngest group in the United States, with a median age of 25.1 years versus 32.6 years for non-Hispanics. There were more than 6.1 million Hispanic children under the age of 18 in 1987 and nearly one-third of them (1.9 million) were under the age of five. In 1986, 10.9% of Hispanics were under five years of age, compared to 9.5% of Blacks and 7.3% of Whites. In 1987, about half of Hispanic children under 18 (2.8 million) had working mothers. Almost three-fourths of these children (4.3 million) were living with both parents and had mothers (2.1 million children) who worked outside the home. The proportion of Hispanic women in the work force has increased from 40% to 50% in the past 15 years, and is expected to continue to increase at a rapid rate. These data indicate that the need for high quality, affordable child care and early childhood education programs will also grow rapidly in coming years.

Affordability is a major concern. We are all aware of projections that most of the new jobs created in the remainder of this century will be service jobs, many of them low-paid. Moreover, Hispanics — especially Hispanic women -- are currently concentrated in low-skill, low-paid positions. Hispanic family income registered no substantial gains during the first half of this decade, and the gap between Hispanic and White family income has been widening for 15 years. In 1972, Hispanic median family income was 71% of White income, in 1980 it was down to 67%, and in 1986 to 65%. The 1986 median family income for Hispanics was $19,995, well below the $30,809 reported for White families and 5% below Hispanic real income in 1978.

Poverty rates for Hispanics remain very high. According to Census figures, the number of Hispanic families below the poverty level in 1986 was 24% higher than in 1981; nearly one-fourth (24.7%) of Hispanic families were poor in 1986. Stark differences are found among Hispanic subgroups; Puerto Rican families had a poverty rate of 38.1%, compared to 24.9% for Mexican Americans, and 13.3% for Cubans.

A key variable which affects the incidence of poverty is the number of families headed by women. Minority families with female heads of household are especially vulnerable to poverty. In 1986, 23.4% of Hispanic-origin families were maintained by women, compared to 16.2% of all U.S. female-headed families. More than half (51.2%) of these lived below the poverty level, compared to 34.6% of all U.S. families. Furthermore, two-thirds (66.7%) of Hispanic children in female-headed families were poor, as were 67.1% of Black children, and 46.3% of White children from female-headed households. Overall, 37.1% of all Hispanic children lived in poverty in 1986, compared to 42.7% of Black children and 15.3% of White children. Poor families cannot afford to purchase high quality child care, and yet the lack of available care contributes to their continued poverty.

III. EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

Education is perhaps the key determinant of employment opportunities, and Hispanics are the most undereducated major population group. In 1986, 11.9% of Hispanics over 25 years of age had completed less than five years of schooling, compared to only 1.8% of the total non-Hispanic population. National studies suggest that up to 56% the Hispanic adults can be considered to be functionally illiterate. As of 1987, only 50.9% of Hispanics 25 years of age and over had completed four years of high school or more, compared to 63.4% of Blacks and 77.0% of Whites. The median number of school years completed by Hispanics as of 1987 was 12.0, compared to 12.4 for Blacks and 12.7 for Whites. The dropout rate for Hispanics remains the highest for any major United States subpopulation, estimated at 45-50%, and is over 70% in some large urban areas.

Early school failure has been shown to be perhaps the greatest predictor of a child's later dropping out of school. Children who are significantly older than the average age for a given grade are said to be enrolled below grade level. Such enrollment may result from a number of factors, but most frequently it is caused by a child's "failing" a grade and being kept back to repeat it. The percentage of Hispanics enrolled below grade level increases steadily and is alarmingly higher than for Whites. For example, in 1984 28% of Hispanics in grades one through four were enrolled below grade level, compared to 21% for Whites. In grades five through eight, 39.5% of Hispanics were enrolled below grade level, compared to 26.9% for Whites. By grades nine through ten, the rate for Hispanics was 43.1%, compared to 26.3% for Whites.

Early school failure is a problem for both English-proficient and limited-English proficient Hispanic children. However, limited-English proficient children are at higher risk of early school failure.

The statistics on limited-English proficient children have important implications for Hispanics and for early childhood education programs. According to national studies*, the number of school-aged children of non-English language backgrounds is expected to increase 40% by the year 2000, a more rapid increase than for children in the general population. The number of Spanish-language-background children is projected to grow at an even higher rate of 55%. Given this projected increase, and given the importance of language-appropriate programs at very early stages in a child's education, the availability of such programs must also grow if these children are to progress successfully through their academic careers.

Several studies of early childhood education programs, such as the Perry Preschool in Michigan, indicate that the programs' impact on poor children is positive in both the short- and long-term. The studies reveal that children enrolled in these programs achieve greater intellectual and social performance as they begin school and achieve greater socioeconomic success later in life. For example, participants in these programs are likely to have more advanced literacy skills and are more likely to earn high school diplomas, to be employed, and to go on to college.

IV. IMPORTANCE OF "SMART START" PROGRAMS

These data make it clear that the "Smart Start" bill is of special concern to Hispanics, who constitute a large and growing proportion of the bill's target population. The Hispanic population is younger and growing faster than the White or Black populations. The number of Hispanics and the proportion of Hispanic women entering the labor force is also increasing rapidly, so child care needs will increase as well.

---

*Waggoner, Dorothy, "Estimates of the Need for Bilingual Education and the Proportion of Children Being Served," IDRA Newsletter, September 1986.

A substantial number of Hispanics are at risk of early school failure, dropping out, or both. Studies have shown that early childhood education programs can effectively reduce many of the causes of early school failure and dropping out. In order to keep Hispanic children traveling successfully through the education pipeline, programs such as those provided for in "Smart Start" are essential.

The National Council of La Raza believes that "Smart Start" can be a important component of an overall strategy to raise educational attainment levels in the Hispanic community because it addresses a very important segment of our population: preschool children. As national studies have shown, early intervention is key to the academic success of educationally and economically disadvantaged children. "Smart Start" would:

- Make available to families who earn up to 115% of the poverty level early childhood education programs that would run full day and year round;
- Require that the programs be comprehensive in nature, addressing the child care, health, nutrition, mental health, social service, as well as education needs of preschool children.
- Require that the programs be "developmentally appropriate" for all children, including those with limited-English proficiency;
- Require that programs meet minimum standards, including a one to ten adult-child ratio, a maximum group size of 20 children, the promotion of active parent involvement, and the assurance of the physical safety of the children served;
- Require that participating states conduct a needs assessment of early childhood education programs; and
- Prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, religion, native language, or handicap in the provision of services.

Recognizing the need for such high-quality programs, the National Council of La Raza is itself currently engaged in a national demonstration of five low-cost community-based educational interventions designed to increase Hispanic school success. Two of the five demonstration models are based on research that shows that early intervention and parent involvement increase children's educational achievement. Over time, programs dealing with preschool children must be developed as well as models for in-school children and youth, and the Council welcomes the growing national recognition of the importance of such efforts.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STRENGTHENING THE BILL

While the National Council of La Raza supports the overall thrust of "Smart Start," we believe some refinements are needed to strengthen the program's ability to serve Hispanic children.

A. Services to Limited-English Proficient Children

The Council supports the current references to services for limited-English proficient children, but believes that some of the provisions should be strengthened.

The legislation stresses that the programs funded under this Act must be "appropriate for the child's age and all areas of the individual child's development, including physical, emotional, social, cognitive, and communication." This requirement is especially important for programs that serve limited-English proficient children. These programs must be staffed by personnel trained in second-language acquisition methods and multicultural education as well as early childhood education. Often this means employing education personnel that are fluent in a child's native language.

It would be a tragedy if, instead of providing limited-English proficient children with a "smart" start in the early school years, programs funded under this Act were to provide these children with an early start in school failure because of inappropriate language programs. Unless the number of early childhood education personnel who are trained in serving limited-English proficient children is increased, programs funded under this Act will not be able to appropriately serve this population. The training provisions of the "Smart Start Act of 1988" should be strengthened to encourage the recruitment of bilingual personnel and provide training existing personnel in second language acquisition and multicultural education.

B. Parent Involvement Provisions

Research and experience have clearly shown that parent involvement improves educational achievement. Given the low educational attainment of Hispanics, the Council believes that the involvement of Hispanic parents in their children's education cannot be simply a supplement to the educational program, but must be a fundamental component of the school curriculum. This standard of parent involvement should apply to "Smart Start."

While understandably not all parents can be extensively involved during the day in this program, since the legislation is partly designed for working parents, parent involvement opportunities should be available to all parents. Programs should have outreach workers who are familiar with the needs of Hispanic families; this includes bilingual personnel where needed. It is critical that early childhood education programs communicate with parents in a language and form the parents understand.

Because "Smart Start" is a pre-kindergarten program, outreach workers should also be sensitive to the concerns of any parent who is not accustomed to the early school enrollment of children.

C. Representation on the State Task Force and Local Policy Group

Both the State Task Force and the Local Policy Group are important bodies in the administration, implementation, and evaluation of this program. The bill mentions that the State Task Force and the Local Policy Group "shall be balanced according to the race, ethnicity and gender of its members." We believe the current language is too vague because it does not ensure the full representation of Hispanics and other minorities.

We recommend that the composition of the State Task Force and the Local Policy Group should be required to reflect the racial and ethnic composition of the affected populations (by state and locality as appropriate).

The National Council of La Raza strongly supports the role of community-based organizations as service providers in this program, and believes the role of these entities in its governance should be strengthened. These entities are often the most successful in reaching hard-to-serve populations (such as those who are poor, minority, and/or limited-English proficient), typically employ bilingual personnel, are located in the communities where Hispanic families live, have developed a rapport with the target population, and provide accessible and effective services. Currently, community-based organizations are only one of several types of entities to be represented jointly as one group in the Local Policy Group for the program. Community-based organizations should be assured full representation on the Local Policy Group.

D. Data Collection Requirements

Data collection requirements should specify the collection of information on the race and ethnicity of all children receiving services and the children on waiting lists for services. The legislation currently requires that data on the socioeconomic background of these children be collected; these statistics do not always include data on race and ethnicity. Such data are important for determining if Hispanic and other minority children are being adequately served, relative to need, assessing outreach efforts, and evaluating the effectiveness of the program's educational component.

VII. CONCLUSION

Since Hispanics are the youngest and most undereducated major population group, it is critical that the "Smart Start Act of 1988" recognize and respond to their needs. This legislation — along with other measures introduced in the 100th Congress designed to provide services to preschool children — is important because it has the potential of preventing early enrollment below grade level, lowering the dropout rate, and ultimately improving the educational attainment of Hispanics overall. The economic success of the Hispanic community, and indeed of our whole society, in the future depends on our ability to provide an appropriate, high quality education to Hispanic children today.

The National Council of La Raza appreciates the opportunity to present our views and we thank the Chairman for his leadership in this field. As always, the National Council stands ready to assist the Committee in whatever way possible to assure that this legislation is strengthened, enacted, and effectively implemented.

The **Chairman**. Thank you very much. We will hear from the rest of the panel and then we will go to the questions. Evelyn Moore.

STATEMENT OF EVELYN MOORE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL BLACK CHILD DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE, WASHINGTON, DC

Ms. **Moore**. On behalf of National Black Child Development Institute, I want to thank you, Senator Kennedy, and the committee, for this opportunity to testify before you this morning on the need for quality early childhood education within the context of the Smart Start legislation.

This morning I want to address three basic issues. First, the pressing need for child care and quality early childhood education within the black community. Second, the relationship that I believe should exist between the public schools and the community in terms of early childhood education. And third, my personal experience in an early childhood education program—the Perry Preschool project in Ypsilanti, Michigan.

The issue of early childhood and child care has been central to the mission of the Institute and its 33 affiliates since its inception. Over the last 17 years, NBCDI has provided leadership and worked in coalitions for the purpose of expanding early childhood and day care opportunities. An example of this has been our work with the Head Start program.

Currently, NBCDI is a member of a broad-based coalition that supports the Act for Better Child Care. And finally, the Institute convenes the Ad Hoc Child Care Coalition composed of over 70 organizations which work together on child care initiatives.

We have been persistently and vigorously engaged in advocacy for quality child care and early childhood education for two basic reasons. One, the benefits that clearly can accrue to our children educationally, as demonstrated by the Perry Preschool program and Head Start. And second, the increasing number of black children living in poverty and in single-headed households. 50.1 percent of black families that are headed by females are poor. And of the approximately 7 million children receiving AFDC payments, roughly 40 percent of those are black.

The families that we are concerned about and serve cannot afford to shoulder the economic weight of child care and quality early childhood education expenses. We believe that public, private and community investment is needed and a diversified system required if this great need for the care and education of our young children is to be met.

For the past three years, the Institute has been involved and concerned regarding the move to place four-year-olds in the public school. This concern resulted in our publishing a report entitled, Safeguards: Guidelines for Establishing Programs for Four-Year-Olds in the Public Schools, which details NBCDI's ten requirements for ensuring quality early childhood programs within the public schools.

The Smart Start legislation incorporates much of what is detailed in our Safeguards. Specifically, we enthusiastically support the provisions for, one, a curriculum that is developmentally appropriate and culturally sensitive. Two, a mandate for public and private coordination drawing upon the expertise and experience of programs such as the Perry Preschool Project and Head Start. Three, standards which guarantee a quality child care experience for children. Four, a professional staff that is trained in early childhood education. Five, provisions to address the nutritional and health needs of children. And six, and very important to us, of course, is parental involvement in education.

These same requirements, spelled out in our Safeguards, were also implemented in the Perry program. In the Perry project, the curriculum was child-centered. The teacher served as a facilitator. The classroom was well organized into interest areas, such as the housekeeping area, the block area, the art area. Children were able to select and access these sections of the classroom at will for a great part of the day.

The daily schedule for children included times for planning, working, and recalling activities. There was a clean-up time and a snack time, and a time for small and large group activities. It is these very measures that safeguard four-year-olds, which form the basis of success for the children participating in the Perry Preschool program in Ypsilanti, Michigan, where I had the opportunity to teach during the 1960's.

As I reflected on my experience as a teacher in the Perry Preschool program and what I would share with you this morning, I was flooded with a lot of memories, and then I had a lot of things I could not remember.

First, I remembered the excitement that was abound in the community and the fact that many, many families were very disappointed that they were unable to get their child into the program due to space limitations and the design of the research project. All of the families that I interviewed somehow felt that if their child could get into this program, perhaps they would be the one who would go on to college and to make the family proud. They knew, even before research results were in, that preschool was important.

Second, I remembered the home visits that encompassed that key ingredient that we all talk about, and that is parental involvement. This was the opportunity for most of the mothers, for the first time to learn about teaching their children in a more formal way. We were able to lend materials to the mothers, and many were enthusiastic about learning to work with their children and how play can be made into a learning experience.

I remember one of my favorite children, a three-year-old who attended the school, lived with his mother in a very small, low-income apartment. Terry attended school every day. He was lively and articulate and able. And in spite of their one-room apartment and their limited income, mother and child had high hopes for their future and were both actively involved in the program. In fact, Terry was one of our bright stars.

I remember one incident where he had spent a lot of time working on how fruit grow. In this instance, it was apples. We had made applesauce, we made apple cider, we made apple pies, and we even went to the apple orchard and picked apples. We thought we would take the children back to the apple orchard in the winter and try to help them to recall their learning experiences. We asked Terry, "Where did the apples go?" And Terry replied, "Honest, teacher, I didn't take all those apples."

Now this to me was a reflection that at three, children are pretty concrete. However, the four-year-olds who were much more able, came through and responded correctly and saved the day for Terry.

Another instance I remember is that we were working on helping children learn to classify, which becomes very important as you become an adult. That is, to know where simple items belong, such as pots and pans belong in the kitchen, clothes in the closets. And we had puzzles and concrete manipulative items for children to use in this learning activity.

Now the question was asked of Donald, "Where did a toothbrush belong?" And he replied, "In the refrigerator." Now we knew Donald knew better, so we persisted in asking the question, where does the toothbrush belong, and he persisted in replying, in the refrigerator. It was sometime afterwards, through our home visits, that we found out that indeed Donald's family did keep their toothbrushes in the refrigerator because they had so many roaches in their home that that was the only way they could safeguard the sanitation of toothbrushes.

In closing, I would also say the Smart Start initiative reflects the Institute's views that all children are truly entitled to a good early childhood development experience that is appropriate to the age of the child and that meets the social and economic needs of the family. Finally, we believe this legislation offers a viable option in the move toward a more comprehensive child development system in this country.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Moore follows:]

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE SENATE
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

PRESENTED BY
EVELYN K. MOORE
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
NATIONAL BLACK CHILD DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE

1463 Rhode Island Avenue N.W.
Washington D.C. 20005
(202) 387 1281

June 10, 1988

On behalf of the National Black Child Development Institute, I would like to thank you for this opportunity to testify before the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources on the critical need for quality early childhood and child care services within the context of the Smart Start legislation. The legislation before us today responds to the need for quality early childhood services in this country, through diversified sponsorship and coordination with community based programs such as Head Start to ensure that all of America's children receive a quality early childhood development experience. Today, I will address three issues:

1. The need for child care within the Black community.
2. The relationship that should exist between the public schools and the community.
3. My personal involvement as an early childhood educator, in the Perry Preschool Project, directed by David Weikart in Ypsilanti, MI.

The issue of early childhood education and child care has been central to the mission of the National Black Child Development Institute since its inception. Over the last seventeen years, NBCDI has served as a leader in the child care community. As part of the 1970 White House Conference on Children, we played a leadership role in making day care the number one priority. NBCDI has been instrumental in the development of major legislative initiatives for child care since 1970, including:

- Comprehensive Child Development Bill introduced by Senator Mondale,
- Senate Bill S2 introduced by Senator Cranston, and
- Alliance for Better Child Care legislation introduced by Senator Dodd and Representative Kildee, which has our full support.

Finally, the Institute provides leadership to the child care community by convening the Ad Hoc Day Care Coalition which is comprised of over 70 organizations representing a variety of advocacy groups working together to improve and expand quality child care programs.

The Need for Child Care in the Black Community

NBCDI has been persistently and vigorously engaged in advocacy for quality child care and early childhood education for two reasons:

> First, the benefits that clearly can accrue to our children educationally, as demonstrated by the Perry Preschool Project and Head Start, and
>
> Second, the increasing number of Black children living in poverty and in single headed households, 50.1 percent of Black families that are headed by females are poor (1986 Census), and of the approximately 7 million children receiving AFDC payments, roughly 40 percent are Black.

Given that the average yearly cost for child care is between $2,500 and $3,500 a year, Black women who must work are under significant financial strain. Clearly, this population cannot shoulder the economic weight of child care expenses alone. It is only through a national effort that involves the public, private and community sectors can this challenge be met. Moreover, we suggest a diversified sponsorship system to meet this need so that all child care options are available to parents. The Smart Start legislation offers one viable mechanism for reaching this goal.

The Role of the Public School

In 1986, the National Black Child Development Institute issued a report entitled, **Child Care in the Public Schools, Incubator for Inequality?,** which examined the emerging trend to put child care programs in the public schools. In this report, we examined the readiness of public schools to serve a younger constituency of Black children. We were concerned about the ability of the public schools to finance and maintain quality early childhood development programs for Black children. We were also concerned about the ability of the public schools to be sensitive to the needs of the community. Most recently, we published a report entitled, **Safeguards: Guidelines for Establishing Programs for Four-Year-Olds in the Public Schools** This report details NBCDI's ten requirements for ensuring quality child care programs in general and within public schools, specifically. Several of our Safeguards address areas in which the public schools and the community should work together. The

Safeguards dictate that a quality early childhood development program in the public schools should:

- maintain an effective parent education program,
- involve parents in the decisions about the curriculum and policy,
- include teachers who come from the community served by the program and who are racially and ethnically representative of the children served,
- include a mechanism for regular, external review by community members and early childhood development experts, and
- include a mechanism to ensure that administrators of public school based early childhood programs do not limit their assessment to, or base their program planning solely on, standardized tests.

NBCDI developed the Safeguards because we recognized that the public school is a viable option for the delivery of early childhood development services to four year olds. Given the high cost of private early childhood development services, as well as fiscal limitations of many Black families, it is an alternative many families can use. However, we want to ensure that these public school programs for four year old children embrace the guidelines developed by NBCDI, the mandates of the Smart Start legislation and the proven success of the Perry Preschool Project. We are pleased to see that the proposed Smart Start legislation incorporates much of what is detailed in our Safeguards. Specifically, we enthusiastically support the provisions for:

1. requiring a curriculum that is developmentally appropriate and culturally sensitive,
2. mandating public and private coordination, drawing upon the experience and expertise of programs like Perry Preschool Project and Head Start,
3. ensuring standards which will guarantee a quality child care experience for children, and
4. eradicating the two-tier system of early childhood delivery by making provisions to ensure that all children, regardless of income have access to these services.

We also believe it is important for the public schools to move away from the more traditional teacher directed activities for four year olds and adopt a curriculum which is more developmentally appropriate for a younger age group. The Perry Preschool Project in Ypsilanti, Mi., where I served during the 1960's, serves as a good model. In the Perry Project, the curriculum was child centered, and the teacher served as a facilitator. The classroom was arranged into interest areas, i.e., housekeeping area, block area and art area. Children were able to select and access these areas of the classroom throughout the day. The daily schedule included opportunities for planning, working, recalling activities, clean up time, snack time, small and large group time. These are the basic components which formed the basis of success for the children participating in the Perry Preschool Program in Ypsilanti, Mi.

As I reflected on my experience as a teacher in the Perry Preschool Project and decided what I would share with you this morning, I was flooded with memories. First, I remembered the excitement that abounded in the community and the fact that many, many families were disappointed that we were unable to take their children into the program due to space limitations and the research design of the project. All families that I interviewed somehow felt that if their children could get in this program, perhaps, they would have a chance to do better in life. They knew even before the research results that preschool was important. Second, I remember home visits. This was the first opportunity for most of the mothers to learn about teaching their children. We were able to lend materials to the mothers, and many were enthusiastic about learning to work with their children and how "play" can be made a learning experience. As a result of the home visit program, "close relationships" developed between teacher and parent, an unusual occurrence in low-income school settings.

I remember one of my favorite children, Terrence, a three year old that lived with his mother in a very small, low-income apartment. Terry attended school everyday, lively articulate and able. And in spite of their one room apartment, mother and child had high hopes for their future and were both actively involved in the program. In fact, Terry was one of our star pupils. I remember one incident where he had spent a lot of time working on how fruit grow. In this instance, it was apples. We had made apple sauce, apple cider, apple pie, etc.; then we went to the apple orchard and picked apples. We thought we would take the children back to the apple orchard in the winter and try to help them to recall their learning experiences. We asked, "Where did the apples go?" and Terry replied, "Honest teacher, I didn't take them!" This was, perhaps, a reflection perhaps that at age three, that children are thinking concretely - however, the four year olds were able to respond correctly and save the day for Terry.

Another instance I remember is that we were working on helping children learn to classify, that is, to know where simple items belong such as pots and pans belong in the kitchen, clothes in the closet, etc. We asked of Donald, "Where does a toothbrush belong?" He replied, "in the refrigerator". We knew Donald knew better and persisted in asking the question. He persisted in replying, "in the refrigerator". Sometime later, we discovered that Donald and his family did indeed keep their toothbrushes in the refrigerator because they lived in a roach infested housing project.

Finally, another incident that brought back a smile, was a little lesson we were giving on what the children wanted to be when they grew up. The answers most youngsters gave related to the experiences we exposed them to such as fireman, policeman, doctor, etc. When we asked Russell, "What will you be when you grow up?" Russell replied, "bigger."

Some children and their families, in spite of poverty, had what we consider middle-class values, and others simply had allowed poverty to steal their hope for a future. But all parents that I worked with believed in and placed high hopes in education, the school and the teacher.

The Perry Preschool longitudinal study showed that children who participated in the program realized increased school success, greater employment opportunities, decreased welfare dependency and enhanced self-esteem. A high quality preschool experience for low-income children can substantially contribute to a foundation upon which to develop the skills which children need to become successful throughout their academic years. The human cost to both families and children would be greatly reduced in the long run if we invested in our children early on.

In closing, the Smart Start initiative reflects the Institute's view that all children are entitled to an early childhood experience that is developmentally appropriate to the age of the child and that meets the social and economic needs of the family. Further, while the Smart Start legislation provides for public school sponsorship of early childhood development programs, it also encourages collaboration with existing early childhood development programs like Head Start which has a proven history of success in the provision of early childhood development services. Finally, we believe this legislation offers a viable option in the move toward a comprhensive child development system in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. Dr. Cobb.

STATEMENT OF CAROLYN COBB, COORDINATOR OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF PUPIL SERVICES ORGANIZATIONS, RALEIGH, NC

Ms. COBB. Senator Kennedy, I am pleased to be able to present testimony today in support of Smart Start on behalf of the National Alliance of Pupil Services Organizations, or NAPSO. I am with the National Association of School Psychologists, which a member of NAPSO. Joining me at the table today is Isadora Hare, the coordinator of NAPSO; she's also with the National Association of Social Workers.

NAPSO is a coalition of 17 professional associations whose members provide a variety of preventive, supportive, and remedial services to assist children and their families in benefiting fully from educational and life experiences. We represent over 300,000 professionals in those 17 associations who are child development specialists.

If there were a persistent disease afflicting our children and youth and we had a vaccine to cure it, we surely would see that they were innoculated. We have considerable evidence today that children are afflicted by persistent problems that threaten their personal well-being, as well as preventing them from becoming productive and contributing citizens.

Sample statistics are: one in four children live in poverty. These are data we are hearing frequently now. Between 25 and 30 percent of our children do not complete high school. An estimated 100,000 up to 400,000 children pass through jails, detention centers or other lock-ups each year. In 1985, almost half a million teenage girls became pregnant.

These sample statistics indicate a loss of maximum personal development and well-being, but they also represent significant social and economic costs to society. The good news is, we can prevent many of these problems. There is, if you will, a vaccine to help ensure healthy development of many children and youth. In fact, we feel it is one of the best kept secrets for the last couple of decades, and that is: quality preschool education, addressing the whole child, does work.

Early childhood intervention is a very well researched area of education now. We know that patterns laid down at ages 3 to 5 transfer to the rest of the child's life. We have research on these intervention programs that says they can have a profound impact on the growth and development of economically and socially disadvantaged children. Results of several high quality studies offer promising outcomes for our neediest children.

These studies agree that we can have better intellectual performance in preschool. We can further reduce graded retention in school, reduce special education placement, and gain better academic achievement. These children are less likely to be adjudicated and to drop out of school. They are more likely to pursue post-secondary education and to be employed later in life. In one study, the teenage pregnancy rate was cut in half compared to teenage girls who did not have similar opportunities.

The programs are clearly cost-efficient and yield ultimate economic benefits to society as a whole. For every dollar invested, we know that we can save up to six dollars in future social and economic costs, as well as the economic returns of these individuals who are now productive members of society. In essence, we can pay now or we will pay more later.

Quality preschool is important for families as well. Our nation has failed to come to grips with today's realities for families. Most mothers of young children, out of necessity, have joined the labor force. This is a massive demographic shift that has made decent child care a necessity for families of every income group, but especially low income families. Parents need adequate and appropriate child care to work and to be productive on the job. Families with the greatest economic need also have the fewest options for child care.

The key word is quality. Smart Start is to be commended for its attention to a comprehensive, developmentally appropriate, and culturally relevant curriculum, smaller child-to-staff ratios, small group size, appropriately trained staff, family involvement and support, and coordination of comprehensive community services. Emphasis on all aspects of a child's development—cognitive, social, emotional, physical and communication skills—is essential. This comprehensive development can best ensure later educational and life success and is best facilitated when families are an integral part of that process.

NAPSO also supports the economic eligibility requirements where 50 percent of the spaces are to be filled by children whose families earn less than 115 percent of the poverty level at no charge, but also allotting the other spaces to families above that line on a sliding scale up to full cost. The provision for economic integration of participants will serve to avoid the development of a two-tiered system of child care and education.

In 1985, two-thirds of four-year-olds in families with annual incomes of $35,000 or more attended preschool programs irrespective of the mother's employment status. In contrast, fewer than 33 percent of four-year-olds in families with annual incomes of less than $10,000 were enrolled in such programs. Preschoolers from poorer families should not be subject to lower quality child care while middle and upper-class children enjoy more enriching experiences.

The team of child development specialists as defined in Smart Start can assist in implementing the integrated and collaborative program envisioned by this legislation, specifically providing things such as assistance in designing a comprehensive and developmentally appropriate curriculum; establishing settings that promote appropriate learning experiences and behavior; providing mental health and social services to children and families; parent outreach and involvement; family support and parent education; liaison between the program and home; in-service education for staff in child development, managing behavior, understanding and appreciating cultural and ethnic differences; and finally, screening and evaluation of children who may at risk of special developmental problems.

Effective early childhood intervention programs require both child care and education. Good child care includes socialization and experiences which foster development. Conversely, quality early childhood education must include comprehensive child care. NAPSO supports the provision that services be available for the full work day and full calendar year. Smart Start programs will, therefore, combine the dual goals of high quality child care and education.

Children constitute about 25 percent of our population, but 100 percent of our future. The success of that future begins to be determined at very young ages. In order to provide the appropriate experiences for young children, preschool must facilitate the development of children over a broad spectrum of skills in areas including cognitive skills; social, interpersonal, and creative potential; and an understanding and acceptance of self and others. Smart Start incorporates essential program elements needed to accomplish these goals.

We thank you for the opportunity to testify and we are pleased that you are focusing on these important issues.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Cobb follows:]

Testimony of

National Alliance of Pupil Services Organizations (NAPSO)

before the

U. S. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources

on

S2270: Community Collaborative for Early
Childhood Development Act (Smart Start)

Presented by

Dr. Carolyn Cobb
National Association of School Psychologists
Coordinator of School Psychology Section
North Carolina Department of Public Instruction
Raleigh, North Carolina

Isadora Hare ACSW, Coordinator of NAPSO,
Staff Director: Commission on Education
National Association of Social Workers
7891 Eastern Avenue
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910
Telephone: 301/565-0333

June 10, 1988

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, I am pleased to be able to present testimony in support of Smart Start on behalf of the National Alliance of Pupil Services Organizations (NAPSO). I am Dr. Carolyn Cobb with the National Association of School Psychologists, a member of NAPSO. I am joined today by Isadora Hare of the National Association of Social Workers and the coordinator of NAPSO.

NAPSO is a coalition of 17 national professional associations whose members provide a variety of preventive, supportive and remedial services that are developmentally appropriate and that assist preschool children and their families in benefitting fully from educational and life experiences. We represent over 300,000 professionals who are child development specialists, including: school counselors, school nurses, school psychologists, school social workers, pupil personnel workers, special educators, speech-language specialists, audiologists, therapeutic recreation specialists and art, music & dance therapists. A list of member associations is attached to this written testimony.

If there were a persistent disease afflicting our children and youth and we had a vaccine that could cure it, we surely would see that they were inoculated. Indeed, there is considerable evidence that our children are afflicted by persistent problems that threaten their personal well-being, as well as preventing many from becoming productive and contributing citizens.

- One in four of our children lives in poverty;
- Between 25-30% of our students do not complete high school;
- An estimated 100,000 to 400,000 youth pass through jails or other lock-ups each year;
- In 1985, 485,000 teenagers became pregnant;

These sample statistics indicate a loss of maximum personal development and well being for children; but they also represent significant social and economic cost to society as a whole. The good news is that many of these problems can be prevented; there is a "vaccine" that can help ensure the healthy development of many children and youth. In fact, one of the best kept secrets of psychology and education is finally slipping out - quality preschool education, addressing the needs of the whole child, works!

Early childhood intervention is one of the most well researched areas in education. Patterns of success laid down by ages 3 to 5 transfer to the rest of the child's life. Research clearly demonstrates that quality preschool intervention programs can have a profound impact on the growth and development of economically and socially disadvantaged children. There are at least 19 quality studies using early educational treatment and control groups that, in aggregate, offer promising outcomes. All studies agree that quality preschool programs for our neediest children result in better intellectual performance in preschool (gains of 8-17 intelligence quotient points), reduced grade retention in school, reduced special education placement, and better academic achievement than for poor children who do not attend. Some studies also indicate that these children are less likely to be adjudicated and to drop out of school, are more likely to attend college, and to be employed later in life. In one study the teenage pregnancy rate of children who attended preschool was one-half the rate of those teenagers who had not had that opportunity. 1

The programs are clearly cost-efficient and yield ultimate economic benefits to society. For every dollar invested in quality preschool, up to $6.00 can be saved in future social and economic costs, as well as the

---

1 Communication from Dr Craig Ramey, Director of Research, Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center, Chapel Hill, NC.

economic returns of individuals who are productive members of society.

Quality preschool is important for families as well. America's children are also vulnerable because our nation has failed to come to grips with today's realities for families. Most mothers of young children have - out of necessity - joined the labor force, a massive demographic shift that has made decent child care a necessity for families from every income group, but especially low income families. Parents need adequate and appropriate child care to work and to be productive on the job. Surveys show that concerns about preschool care often result in absenteeism and reduced productivity. Families with the greatest economic need have the fewest options for child care.

The key word is quality. Smart Start is to be commended for its attention to a comprehensive developmentally appropriate and culturally relevant curriculum; small child-to-staff ratios; small group size; appropriately trained staff; family involvement and support; and coordination of comprehensive community services. Emphasis on all aspects of a child's development, including cognitive, social, emotional, physical and communication skills, is essential. This comprehensive development can best ensure later educational and life success and is best facilitated when families are an integral part of the process.

NAPSO supports the economic eligibility requirements of Smart Start. While at least 50 percent of spaces funded under the act are to be filled by children whose families earn less than 115 percent of the poverty level at no charge to the parent, eligible children in families with incomes above 115 percent of the poverty line are also eligible for services with payment of fees on a sliding scale up to the full cost of such services. This provision for the economic integration of participants will serve to avoid the development of a two-tiered system of child care and education. In 1985 two thirds of four-year-olds in families with annual incomes of $35,000 or more attended preschool programs irrespective of the mother's employment status. In contrast, fewer than 33 percent of four-year-olds in families with annual incomes of less than $10,000 were enrolled in such programs. Preschoolers from poorer families should not be subject to lower quality child care while middle-and upper-class children enjoy more enriching experiences.

This interdisciplinary team of child development specialists as defined in Smart Start can assist in effectively implementing the integrated, collaborative program envisioned by Smart Start, specifically providing:

- assistance in designing a comprehensive and developmentally appropriate curriculum, including language-rich programs;
- assistance in establishing a setting that promotes appropriate behavior and learning experience;
- mental health and social service needs to pre-kindergarten children and their families;
- parent outreach and involvement,
- family support and parent education;
- liaison between the program and families, including home visits;
- inservice education for staff in child development, managing behavior, and understanding and appreciating cultural and ethnic differences;
- screening and evaluation of children who may be at-risk of special developmental problems.

Effective early childhood intervention programs require both child care and education. Good child care includes socialization and experiences which foster development. Conversely, quality early childhood education must include comprehensive child care. NAPSO supports the provision that services be available for the full work-day and full calendar year. Smart Start programs will therefore combine the dual goals of high-quality child care and education. These are in accord with the demographic realities confronting this nation at present and in the years ahead. Today fifty percent of all mothers with preschool children (15 million) are in the labor force.

Children constitute 25 percent of our population but 100 percent of our future. The success of that future begins to be determined at very young ages. In order to provide the appropriate experiences for young children, preschool must facilitate development of children over a broad spectrum including cognitive skills, social interpersonal and creative potential; and an understanding and acceptance of self and others. Smart Start incorporates essential program elements needed to accomplish these goals.

We thank the committee for the opportunity to testify and we are pleased that you are focusing attention on these important issues.

NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF PUPIL SERVICES ORGANIZATIONS

The National Alliance of Pupil Services Organizations (NAPSO) is a coalition of national professional organizations whose members provide a variety of remedial, supportive and preventive services required to assist children to benefit fully from their education.

These organizations represent 275,000 professionals including school counselors, school nurses, occupational therapists, physical therapists, school psychologists, pupil personnel workers, school social workers, special educators, speech-language pathologists, audiologists, therapeutic recreation specialists and art, music and dance therapists.

Typically these professionals provide services which are classified within school systems as special education and related services required by law for handicapped students, while some are provided as pupil services available to all students who may need them. The services include assessment and diagnosis as well as direct provision of education, therapy and counseling to students with special needs including those who are handicapped, disadvantaged or experiencing other problems which interfere with learning. NAPSO works in close collaboration with organizations representing teachers, administrators, parents and students.

1. To provide and disseminate interdisciplinary positions on issues relevant to education.
2. To facilitate communication and cooperation among member organizations.
3. To speak with one voice to federal agencies, and the United States Congress on relevant education issues.
4. To provide professional input into regulations, studies and research pertaining to education.
5. To participate in public policy advocacy through the design and promotion of legislation.
6. To mobilize grassroots action on behalf of all concerned with students' needs and pupil services.

NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF PUPIL SERVICES ORGANIZATIONS

American Art Therapy Association
American Association for Counseling and Development
American Dance Therapy Association
American Occupational Therapy Association
American Psychological Association
American Psychological Association (Division 16: Division of School Psychology)
American Physical Therapy Association
American Society of Allied Health Professions
American Speech-Language-Hearing Association
Council of Directors of School Psychology Programs
Council for Exceptional Children
National Association of Pupil Personnel Administrators
National Association of School Psychologists
National Association of School Nurses
National Association of Social Workers
National Council of State Consultants for School Social Work
National Recreation and Park Association

Coordinator, 1986-87: Isadora Hare, National Association of Social Workers, Inc.
7981 Eastern Avenue, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910, (301) 565-0333.

1/87

The **Chairman**. Thank you very much.

Let me ask you, Mr. Vargas, with regard to bicultural activities in Head Start programs which are attended for the most part by Hispanics, are you pretty well satisfied with that aspect of the program?

Mr. **Vargas**. Sir, to be completely honest, I am not entirely familiar with the Head Start program.

The **Chairman**. When you were talking about sort of the bicultural and bilingual aspects of the Smart Start program, I was interested in what had been worked out regarding parental involvement. Parents guiding the Head Start program, would likely insist on that mix for the most part. I was interested in whether that program is constructive with regards to the type of bicultural and bilingual features which you have advocated in your statement.

Mr. **Vargas**. Our main concern is that we support all the provisions related to limited-English proficient children and think they are very, very good. Our strongest concern is that early childhood education personnel also need to be experts in working with limited-English proficient children. They need to be experts in how children learn a second language, and building on the things that the children bring to the classroom, bring to the program, and building on that so that they can truly be developmental programs. So as long as the personnel are trained in working with these children, I think that these programs have a strong promise of success, with the parents involvement.

The **Chairman**. Ms. Moore, let me ask you. One of the great challenges is—and we will hear more about it later today—which agencies are going to provide these services. Basically, my vision of the Smart Start is it is really a funding stream to build on existing agencies that are providing services within the community, whether they are Head Start programs, maybe some day care programs funded by ABC. And an essential element in education, Smart Start, of course.

As we weave our way through issues of institutional control I would be interested in your advice.

Ms. **Moore**. You are referring to sponsorship, right?

The **Chairman**. Yes. We will hear later about the importance of running this through departments of education. Others will advocate human services. How we are going to weave our way through that.

Ms. **Moore**. It is a sticky wicket. But I have stuck pretty much to the notion that we have to have a diversified system in this country because we have just had too many sponsorships invested, such as the church has been sponsoring good and quality child care for a long time. We have had the state of California, which indeed does have their child care system that is sponsored through their Department of Education and is able to be responsive to community-based as well as the school-sponsored early childhood education programs.

And my recollection of the Perry Preschool program, which was a little while ago, is that that even though it was placed in the public schools, it was not administered by the public school at that time. It was administered by another group. So that I think that there can be a combination of sponsors. I think some of these determinations have to take place on the local level.

However, at the state level, I like the idea of leaving some openness. That is, the Department of Education or the Department of Social Services and the governor helping to make that kind of determination.

Also appealing to me is to have, at the state level, a special kind of early childhood office; an Office of Child Development for lack of a better term. But I think we have to go with a diversified system. That is my answer. And I think it is going to have to be worked out at the state level, and that that sponsorship should stay open and there should a way to determine what is best for the children in that state.

The CHAIRMAN. You certainly do not want to replicate or duplicate.

Ms. MOORE. That is right. Like California, for example. I mean, it is set up. We would not want to create a new system there.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Cobb, could you address that issue, too?

Ms. COBB. It is difficult. In my own state, we have been struggling with some pilot monies, state funding for some public preschool programs. After a year of debate between the department of education and our department of human resources, they finally reached a compromise saying the education department would be a fiscal agent, but the money will be divided equally between the two departments to pursue different sponsoring agents to develop these pilot programs. So that we have a single fiscal agent but we are also encouraging a variety of different sponsors and programs in different day care settings, as well as public schools. It may be different in each state. It is truly a difficult jurisdictional issue and also a collaborative one. That is what we are trying at least in our state.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you do an evaluation then of each of the programs whether they come through human services or education?

Ms. COBB. Regardless of where they are established and sponsored.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you drawn any conclusions or is it too early?

Ms. COBB. Not yet. It is too early. It really is.

The CHAIRMAN. In the Perry program they have developed a curriculum, the High Scope curriculum. I guess we are going to hear more about that later. That obviously has proven itself to be a successful type of a curriculum. Is that generally assumed to be the case? Are there alternative kinds of curriculum? Ms. Moore?

Ms. MOORE. I think one of the things we really have to guard against is that when we bring, and if schools are going to become heavily involved in the instruction of young children, that we do not turn it into the kindergarten where all the children are sitting up like soldiers, lining up going to the bathroom, and the boys go to the boys and the girls go to the girls. We really cannot do this to young children because young children learn differently.

I think the Perry Preschool program offers a model for us that responds to how young children learn. I think this is—there is a lot of legitimacy in the concern that people have in terms of schools coming into the business of educating very young children because schools have not been known for allowing children a lot of freedom. And young children need that opportunity to—they learn in an active way, not sitting passively behind the desk.

I think that we have got to keep that element, and we have got to build the protections in to ensure that what is presently happening, particularly to minority young children, does not happen to a new group.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, thank you very much. We will look forward to working with all of you as we move along with the legislation.

On our next panel is Roseann Bentley, the president of the Missouri State Board of Education, soon to be president of the National Association of State Boards of Education. NASBE has been holding hearings across the country beginning in Boston on the subject of early childhood education. I hope Ms. Bentley will share some of the insights gained from the hearings.

Dr. Barbara Willer is the director of Information Services and Public Policy of the National Association for the Education of Young Children, an organization that has a great deal of expertise in early childhood education. We want to hear what Dr. Willer has to say.

And Nancy Jenkins is the vice president for education of the California Parent-Teachers Association, and has done writing and research in the area of early childhood education, and comes to us as an expert. She has come all the way from California and we are very grateful to have her with us today. Thank you very much.

We are going to start off with you, Ms. Jenkins. You came the furthest.

Ms. JENKINS. I get first chance.

STATEMENT OF NANCY JENKINS, VICE PRESIDENT FOR EDUCATION, CALIFORNIA PARENT-TEACHER ASSOCIATION, LA MIRADA, CA

Ms. JENKINS. Good morning. As you have said, I am Nancy Jenkins, California PTA vice president for education. I also served for seven years as PTA's volunteer advocate for education in the California state legislature, and as a local school board member for 12 years in La Mirada.

Senator, I would like to say at this point, in answer to one of your questions, our school district did operate a federal Head Start as well as a State Preschool program, and our parents in that program were basically the bilingual or the monolingual Spanish parents in that community. The program was very satisfying to them. Perhaps my only concern was that the program was limited to just one group of children, and therefore I felt they were somewhat isolated in the experiences of learning about other social groups of children. But we had such a demand, there was always a waiting list. And we obviously had to serve the parents and the children that were in greatest need of this program.

I was also coordinator of a paper for state PTA called Education in the Early Years: Ages Four to Six. And I am serving as PTA's liaison to the governor's task force on at-risk children, where I believe a major thrust of the work will have to be early educational and developmental intervention of this group of young people.

Today, however, I am pleased to present National PTA's comments on Smart Start. It is a measure that would access learning opportunities to a greater number of four-year-olds. That is desperately needed, because an increasing number of parents are seeking preschool experiences for their children, pre-kindergarten enrollment rose from 11 percent in 1965 to nearly 40 percent by 1986.

The increase of four-year-old preschool programs is a result of several factors. Many parents in the labor force, for example, use these programs as viable child care alternatives. On the other hand, in families where one guardian works within the home, parents often elect to enhance their child's development and social skills by sending them to an early childhood education program.

Whatever the motivation, the message is clear: a growing percentage of parents not only want, but desperately need, some type of preschool experience for their children. Unfortunately, some children will be denied the opportunity because in most locations there is just not enough slots available for the demand.

In some instances, programs are offered only on a half-day basis, an inconvenient option for full-time working parents. Problems also arise when the programs run on an academic calendar, forcing parents to arrange sometimes very inadequate substitute child-care during vacation periods.

And most importantly and tragically, some youngsters will not attend preschool because their parents cannot afford the cost of tuition and fees, creating what we perceive to be an increasing problem for this country in having a two-tier system between those who will receive services and those who will be denied access to early education programs.

In doing so, we see that this denies the same children access in later years to higher education. Unless given assistance, these children from poor families will not be able to be enrolled in early education to the degree that are children from more advantaged families.

National PTA supports early childhood education programs that are designed to meet the varying needs of all families. Smart Start, we feel, takes a positive step forward and exerts leadership at the federal level, and this leadership is desperately needed so that a larger number of children can receive the benefits of quality early childhood education. We particularly like the fact that they will provide funds to states, and to local communities, to establish, expand and upgrade programs for four-year-olds.

Further, the services under these funds must be offered on a full-day, all-year basis. As I said, there is a severe problem where both parents or a single parent is working. And that the fees will be charged on a sliding scale, or in some instances, the services offered free of charge. The measure enhances opportunities for the at-risk students or the potential at-risk students by requiring that 50 percent of all slots in a facility be reserved for children from low income families.

Smart Start embodies several other principles paramount to the National PTA, such as federal monies being tied to minimum standards. And secondly, adequate compensation of care-givers. We really appreciate the fact that you are building in a career ladder for these people because they are extremely underpaid and we need well qualified care-givers.

Let me concentrate on two other pieces that are of importance to PTA, and that is the developmental needs of children and a strong parental involvement component. (The lady that was with the Perry Preschool project spoke more eloquently than I can. I can only second everything that she said.)

We believe for the child, developmentally appropriate services are essential. Like many other associations, the National PTA has adopted a policy where formalized academic curriculum is discouraged in favor of allowing young children to learn through their experience. Children need not be forced to learn. They are motivated by a sense and a desire to understand the world about them.

The California state PTA recently adopted a paper, which I alluded to earlier, emphasizing our support of this philosophy and it is being very well received throughout the state by all kinds of groups, even including the State Department of Education who has done their own school readiness task force report.

Smart Start encourages the establishment of a learning environment where children are encouraged to learn through exploration, creative problem solving, and individualized attention by care-givers trained and well qualified in early childhood development and education.

Equally important to us is the parental involvement component of the measure. We feel it is a parenting bill as well as a child development proposal. And since we believe parents are a critical factor in helping children succeed during their formative years, we would suggest strengthening the language in the Section 10.7, item 8.

National PTA is encouraged by Smart Start's requirement that parents be involved in the planning and evaluation stages of the program, because you have to help parents understand if you are going to have them prepared to make good decisions in support of the program. This is enhanced when parents are made part of the process, given access to the facilities for observation and discussion with the professional educators. We also support, most assuredly, the use of home visits, group meetings and parent education sessions as a regular feature of the early childhood program.

Child care and preschool programs are part of a life-long learning continuum. Our association feels that a well crafted structure that incorporates a viable parent involvement component improves the likelihood that a pattern of parent/provider/teacher interaction will be established.

In southern California where I live, we are only too sensitive to the fact that parents are intimidated by the education institution. And as PTA we are trying to find ways to intervene and assist administrators, principals and teachers to reach out to parents and bring them into the school, bring them into communication, because many times our parents are just not able to do that on their own.

We think that this partnership and model of involvement can then been sustained throughout a child's formal education. Consequently, a strong parental involvement provision, as in Smart

Start, should be emulated in any other federal legislation or programs that are devised.

Other key elements of the bill that National PTA endorses include the requirement that programs be coordinated at the local level with nutrition, health and other social service agencies, as well as with the public schools. While we believe the education community must clearly take a leadership role in offering quality education programs for young children, they must do it with assistance from all agencies.

The California PTA recently wrote a paper to the governor's task force saying that schools are being asked to do everything. There are services that they desperately need for children that are at-risk, and these services could be provided by the other agencies, if we can find some way to break down the barriers, or turfdom, or whatever it is that keeps the health agency from being a part of the school day and providing the services that are necessary, et cetera.

Consequently, we think establishing the administrative authority within the Department of Education is another feature of the Smart Start bill that the National PTA supports. There is a growing recognition that preschool programs are no longer a "social service."

I have to admit that when I first found out that education was considered part of the social service structure, I was a bit overcome because I felt it was something that stood on its own feet; was an extremely important part of the infrastructure of our society.

These programs must function as a method whereby youngsters can receive developmentally appropriate learning activities. Therefore, again I reiterate that DOE is the logical federal agency to oversee the expansion and coordination of preschool programs.

National PTA believes that schools can play a key role in meeting a family's child care needs, whether they offer a school-age or a preschool program. Yet, as I said, the education community cannot work within a vacuum, nor without additional resources. Better and more effective communication must occur among parents, providers, early childhood development experts and appropriate community organizations.

The debate of child care and early childhood education is no longer focused on the question of should there be federal involvement, but rather we believe, the fact that it must be. It is a debate now on how to address these concerns from a national perspective and to do so in a timely fashion. In California, we sense that time is running out on us unless we can do something to alleviate the two-tier system that is beginning to be very apparent.

The National PTA recognizes that Smart Start is but one element of a very broad child care and early childhood education agenda that must be dealt with by Congress members. It is a well crafted bill that would serve to help meet the needs of families who want to give their four-year-olds the opportunity to attend preschool.

It can be an important early education intervention program for the at-risk child. Attending preschool programs will assist many low income children to enter elementary school on a more equal footing with their more affluent peers.

This is obviously sound economic policy. I was at the national forum for at-risk youth and heard Owen Butler reiterate these concerns in a very eloquent way. Studies show that early intervention programs return $6 to every $1 invested. Studies show that high quality early education programs do enhance a child's future productivity by reducing the rate of school dropouts, teen pregnancy, welfare dependency, and crime. Other witnesses have also told you this in a more eloquent way than I.

I can only end by saying that we thank you for your sensitivity to the needs and your work in this area, and we support this measure.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Jenkins follows:]

7

The National PTA
Office of Governmental Relations
1201 16th Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 822-7878

Testimony by the National PTA

Before the Labor and Human Resources Committee

U.S. Senate

regarding

Smart Start: The Community Collaborative for Early Childhood Development Act

by

Nancy Jenkins

California PTA Vice-president for Education

June 10, 1988

Good Morning. I am Nancy Jenkins, California PTA Vice-president for Education. I have served seven years as California PTA's volunteer advocate to the State Assembly; as a local school board member for 12 years in La Mirada, California; coordinated the research and writing of a report entitled Education in the Early Years: Ages 4-6; and I am presently serving on the Governor's Task Force on At-Risk Children where a major thrust has been on early educational and developmental intervention of at-risk youngsters.

Today I am representing the National PTA, an organization of 6.4 million parents, teachers and concerned citizens who support the advancement of public policy that enhances the quality of life for children and their families. I am pleased to present the National PTA's comments on "Smart Start: The Community Collaborative for Early Childhood Development Act," a measure that would access learning opportunities to a greater number of four-year-olds.

An increasing number of parents are seeking preschool experiences for their children. Pre-kindergarten enrollment rose from 11 percent in 1965 to nearly 40 percent by 1986. A 1987 Census

Bureau report stated that some 2.5 million three- and four-year-olds were enrolled in preschool nationwide in 1985, a 25 percent increase from 1980 and a 400 percent increase over 1965.

The proliferation of four-year-old programs is the result of several factors. Many parents in the labor force, for example, view these programs as a viable child care alternative. On the other hand, in families where one guardian works within the home, parents often elect to enhance their child's development and social skills by sending them to an early education program.

Whatever the motivation, the message is clear: a growing percentage of parents want some type of preschool experience for their children. Unfortunately, some children will be denied the opportunity. In too many locations the availability of four-year-old programs has not kept pace with the demand, and there are not enough slots for the number of eligible children. This shortage is reflected in data on Head Start, which nationally serves approximately 18 percent of the qualifying population.

In some instances programs are offered on a half-day basis, an inconvenient option for full-time working parents. Problems also arise when programs run on an academic calendar, forcing parents to arrange substitute care.

And tragically, some youngsters won't attend preschool because their parents can not afford the cost of tuition and fees, thereby creating a two-tier system between those who will receive services and those who will be denied access to early education programs. Poor children are less likely to be enrolled in an early education program than are children from more advantaged families. In 1985, fewer than 33 percent of four-year-olds whose families had annual incomes of less than $10,000 were enrolled in a preschool program. Yet, 67 percent of the four-year-olds whose parent(s) earned $35,000 a year or more attended preschool.

The National PTA supports early childhood education programs that are designed to meet the varying needs of all families. Smart Start takes a positive step forward, and exerts leadership at the federal level, so that a larger number of children can receive the benefits of quality early childhood education. The bill provides funds to states and localities to establish, expand and upgrade these programs for four-year-olds.

Further, services under these funds must be offered on a full-day, all-year basis. Cost problems are factored in by mandating that fees be charged on a sliding-scale basis or, in some instances, services would be offered free of charge. The measure also enhances opportunities for at-risk students by requiring that 50 percent of all slots in a facility be reserved for children from low income families.

The National PTA holds the position that any federal initiative must be conducted in partnership with state and local agencies. Smart Start fosters that concept by allowing states and localities the flexibility to choose the method of service delivery that best meets an area's need and to build on the child care initiatives that are already made available.

Smart Start embodies several other principles paramount to the National PTA, such as: 1) federal monies tied to minimum standards; 2) adequate compensation of caregivers; 3) the developmental needs of children; and 4) a strong parental involvement component.

For the child, developmentally appropriate services are essential. Like many associations, the National PTA has adopted a policy whereby formalized academic curriculum is discouraged in favor of allowing young children to learn through their experience. Children need not be forced to learn; they are motivated by a desire to make sense of the world.

Subjecting preschoolers to structured teaching techniques, originally designed for elementary school children, is what some scholars dub as the "miseducation" of young persons. Smart Start encourages the establishment of a learning environment where children are encouraged to learn through exploration, creative problem solving and individualized attention by caregivers trained in early childhood education and development.

Equally important is the parental involvement component of the measure. Smart Start is a "parenting bill", as well as a child development proposal. Parents are a critical factor in helping children succeed during their formative years.

The National PTA is encouraged by Smart Start's requirement that parents be involved in the planning and evaluation stages of the program. Involvement and decision-making are enhanced by allowing parental access to facilities for observation and encouraging the use of home visits, group meetings and parent education sessions as regular features of the early childhood program.

Child care and preschool programs are part of a life-long learning continuum. Our association feels that a well crafted structure that incorporates a viable parent involvement component improves the likelihood that a pattern of parent/provider/teacher interaction will be established. This partnership and model of involvement can be sustained throughout a child's formal education. Consequently, a strong parental involvement provision, as in Smart Start, should be emulated in other federal education and human services legislation.

Other key elements of the Smart Start bill that the National PTA endorses, include the requirement that programs be coordinated with the nutrition, health and other social service agencies, as well as the public schools. The education community must clearly take a leadership role in offering quality education programs for young children.

Consequently, establishing administrative authority within the Department of Education (DOE) is another feature of the Smart Start bill that the National PTA supports. Early childhood education programs, whether operated by a public school or private center, often structure organized learning activities into their services.

Further, there is a growing recognition that preschool programs are no longer a social service, but function as a method whereby youngsters can receive developmentally appropriate stimulation. Therefore, the DOE is the logical federal agency to oversee the expansion and coordination of preschool programs.

The National PTA believes that schools can play a key role in meeting a family's child care needs, whether they offer a school-age or preschool program. Yet, the education community cannot work within a vaccuum, nor without additional resources. Better and more effectual communication must occur among parents, providers, early childhood development experts and appropriate community organization representatives.

The debate of child care and early childhood education is no longer focused on the question of should there be federal involvement, but how to address these concerns from a national prospective and do so in a timely fashion.

The National PTA recognizes that Smart Start applies to only one element of a very broad child care and early childhood education agenda that must be dealt with by Congressmembers. Still, Smart Start is a well crafted bill that would serve to help meet the needs of families who want to give their four-year-old the opportunity to attend preschool.

Further, Smart Start is an early education intervention program. Attending preschool programs will assist many low income children in entering elementary school on equal footing with more affluent peers.

Smart Start is also sound economic policy. Studies show that early intervention programs return six dollars to every one dollar invested. Studies show that high quality early education programs do enhance a child's future productivity by reducing the rate of school dropouts, teen pregnancy, welfare dependency and crime.

This legislation advances the concept that four-year-old programs offer learning opportunities and are not just a social service. Children's and parents' concerns are captured in the bill's provisions, meeting the varying needs of all families. We thank the sponsors of this measure and offer our support for Smart Start.

The **Chairman**. Thank you very much. That is very helpful.
Ms. Willer.

STATEMENT OF BARBARA WILLER, DIRECTOR, INFORMATION SERVICES AND PUBLIC POLICY, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE EDUCATION OF YOUNG CHILDREN, WASHINGTON, DC

Ms. **Willer**. Thank you. My name is Barbara Willer, and I am the director of Information Services and Public Policy for the National Association for the Education of Young Children, better known as NAEYC. We are the largest professional association of early childhood educators in the country with more than 63,000 members currently.

We were founded in 1926, and our mission has remained unchanged: to assure that high quality early childhood programs are available to all young children and their families. We have worked to fulfill this mission in two major ways: by providing tools and resources to improve the professional practice of early childhood education and by striving to build public understanding and support for high quality early childhood programs.

Given this focus, it is a pleasure to be here today to discuss what our association believes are necessary components of high quality programs. I have to say at the outset that our governing board has not yet had the opportunity to formally discuss the endorsement of this bill, so my remarks today reflect positions that our association has already adopted regarding guidelines for legislation that either expand or create new services for child care, as well as our guidelines for high quality programs.

Of course, there has been a tremendous interest in early childhood issues in this session of Congress. Frankly, we recognize this growing interest and believe that it is long overdue. As we all know, life in this country for families with young children has undergone dramatic changes within the past two decades, and our national policies have not kept pace with these changes.

There are two trends in particular that I want to highlight today—and of course, these are not new facts to anyone—but the growth in labor force participation by mothers of young children, as well as the increased attendance in preschool programs. The changes are very much linked together, but the growth in preschool programs is not only due to the participation of mothers in the labor force. Because if you look at preschool attendance for children whose mothers are not in the labor force, that too has grown from 37 percent in 1970 to over 50 percent in 1985.

We know that early childhood programs are good for young children, particularly children who are deemed at risk for later school failure. Yet the overall figures of the growth of preschool attendance masks a disturbing fact. That is that children of affluent families are more likely to attend preschool programs than are children of families with fewer economic resources.

The difference is startling. A new report prepared by the Carnegie Foundation reports that by age four, 75 percent of children in families with incomes higher than $25,000 will attend preschool programs, while only 33 percent of children in families with income below $15,000 will attend such programs.

As a society, it is to our benefit to assure that all young children have access to high quality early childhood experiences that will give them a good start to success, not just in school but as contributing members of society. Yet publicly supported access to such programs is limited. By and large, most preschool programs rely heavily on parent fees as a primary funding source. And because parent fees for child care come at the same time when parents are usually just starting off in their careers there are often fewer resources to spend on these needed services.

Of course, we know that access to publicly funded early childhood programs is limited. Head Start, it is estimated, serves only 18 percent of eligible children. While the number of state-funded preschool programs for at-risk children has grown very rapidly in recent years, these programs too fall far short of the need. Also, many of these programs that are targeted to economically disadvantaged children operate only on the part-day, part-year basis and make it difficult for families most in need of work to also arrange for child care. And this is a point that I really must stress for we cannot divorce children's needs for high quality educational experiences from many families' needs for child care. We feel that attempts to consider child care and early childhood education as separate entities are harmful to children, and the results of non-coordination can be both costly and frustrating to parents as well as to policymakers.

Let me also note in this regard that we must consider the care and education needs for all young children, and I was glad to hear in your opening statement, Senator Kennedy, the fact that you do not see Smart Start as an alternative to a comprehensive child care bill like ABC; because while this bill has stressed the needs for high quality programs for four-year-olds—and it is an incredibly important fact to do that—we cannot overlook the full early childhood age range and the fact that in many communities the most pressing needs are for infant and school-aged child care. I agree with your statement earlier that this bill will be enhanced if ABC is in place, and the two can work together quite well.

As we talk about the importance of not separating child care and education for young children, often the retort is: But we do not want four-year-olds sitting at desks and listening to the teacher. And to that I say neither do we. We firmly believe that education must be tailored to the age and the needs of the children served. Teaching four-year-olds is as different from teaching seven-year-olds as teaching junior high school students differs from teaching college. In fact, the distinctions may be greater because of the very rapid changes that occur in the way that children think. These happen between the preschool and early elementary years.

In the early years, the most important determinant of program quality is what happens between individual teachers and students. Frankly, these individual behaviors are not easily "legislatable," but we can and should legislate requirements that maximize the likelihood that children will receive a high quality educational experience. Particularly important in this regard is assuring that sufficient numbers of well-trained teachers are available. The one-to-ten staff-child ratio and the maximum group size of 20 which are specified in the Smart Start legislation fall within the recommended limits that are set forth in NAEYC's criteria for high quality early childhood programs. These criteria serve as the basis for our accreditation system which is the system for recognizing high quality programs. The criteria recommends staff-child ratios ranging from one-to-eight to one-to-ten and group size between 16 and 20 for four-year-olds.

But assuring good numbers is only a part of the picture. Specialized staff training in early childhood education is critical. Again, we cannot expect to teach four-year-olds the same way we teach children at age six. Preschool children, as we have heard already this morning, learn best by doing. They need to have a wide range of materials and activities relevant to their own lives and experiences.

Of course, what is most educational for a four-year-old looks suspiciously like play: using building blocks, water and sand, dictating stories to a teacher, making up recipes, et cetera. The teacher acts less like an instructor and more like a facilitator or guide. In high quality programs you will not see children sitting at desks doing work sheets; instead, you will see small groups of children actively engaged in the pursuit of knowledge—asking "why" and then figuring out ways to find out answers; learning to get along with other children; beginning to recognize another's point of view; and learning that different ways of doing something can still be right; and most importantly, learning that school is a fun place where you can be successful. These are lessons, which much more than work sheets, can provide the basis for success in later school years. For as we all have quickly learned, adulthood is not simply a series of fill-in-the-blank options.

It takes much skill and understanding to know how to teach young children in what we call a developmentally appropriate manner. Teachers of young children need to understand how children grow——

The CHAIRMAN. Let me just mention we are going to leave at 9:15, and then I am going to come back, hopefully at quarter of 10:00. Then I have to leave at 10:20 again. So we are going to run into a little time problem. I would like to see, before I leave, if I could hear briefly from Ms. Bentley as well. So give us a couple of minutes, and then we will hear Ms. Bentley. Then I will ask the staff if they would just maybe ask one or two questions in my absence, if that is okay.

Ms. WILLER. Okay. In terms of the staff, it is not only important that they have the training, but what we have found is that even when our staff are trained that we are having problems recruiting and retaining them because of the inadequate salaries that are often provided. It is a shameful commentary on the fact that we value our teachers of young children so poorly. I also wanted to comment that Smart Start does recognize this by building in requirements that both linking training to salary schedules and building recruitment and retention.

Let me skip, then, to in addition to some of the characteristics of what makes for good programs, it is important to consider how programs fit into the existing range of services that are provided. In this context, I think it is important to recognize that there is a long and distinguished tradition of both public and private services. And as new services come in, particular care needs to be given to both the planning and implementation to avoid overlap and duplication as we have talked about.

The coordination of services at all levels, from Federal to local, is absolutely essential. We need resources too desperately to waste money on either duplication or reinventing the wheel. We have often described our childcare system as a series of patchwork arrangements, and we need to look for strategies that can both support the richness of diversity within the system while helping to build a coherent whole. At all costs, we should avoid putting in place structures that may cause further fragmentation.

With that, let me end that we will work with you to assure that all young children have the access to the high quality programs that they need.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Willer, with an attachment, follows:]

naeyc

National Association for the Education of Young Children 1834 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20009 202 232 8777 800 424-2460

Testimony to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources

United States Senate

June 10, 1988

Barbara A. Willer, Ph.D.

Director of Information Services and Public Policy

National Association for the Education of Young Children

My name is Barbara Willer, and I am the Director of Information Services and Public Policy for the National Association for the Education of Young Children, better known as NAEYC. NAEYC is the country's largest professional association of early childhood educators, with a membership of more than 63,000. Founded in 1926, our mission has remained unchanged: to assure that high quality early childhood programs are available to all young children and their families. We have worked to fulfill our mission in two major ways: (1) providing tools and resources to improve professional practice of early childhood education and (2) striving to build public understanding and support for high quality early childhood programs.

Given this focus, it is a pleasure to be here today to discuss what our Association believes are necessary components of high quality programs. Let me say at the outset that our Governing Board has not yet had the opportunity to formally discuss the endorsement of this bill. My remarks today will reflect positions that the association has adopted regarding guidelines for legislation that expands or creates new services for young children and our guidelines for high quality programs.

As you know, there has been tremendous interest in early childhood issues in this session of Congress. NAEYC welcomes this growing interest, and frankly, I believe, it is long overdue. Life for families with young children has undergone a dramatic transformation in the last 2 decades, and our national policies have not kept pace with these changes.

There are 2 trends in particular I want to highlight: the growth in labor force participation by mothers of young children, and the increased attendance in preschool programs. We are all well aware of the rapid increase in labor force participation rates by mothers with young children (age 5 and under), climbing from 30% in 1970 to 54% in 1985 (House Select Committee on Children, Youth & Families, 1987). During that same time, preschool attendance grew from 37.5% in 1970 to 54.6% in 1985. The growth in preschool programs is certainly tied to growth in mothers' labor force participation, but this is not the sole cause. Preschool attendance of children whose mothers are _not_ in the labor force also climbed, from 37.0% in 1970 to 50.4% in 1985 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1988).

We know that high quality programs are good for children, especially for children deemed at risk for later school failure. Yet, the overall figures of the growth of preschool attendance masks a disturbing fact: children of affluent families are more likely to attend preschool programs than are children of families with fewer economic resources. The difference is startling; by age 4, 75% of children in families with incomes higher than $25,000 attend preschool while only 33% of children in families with income below $15,000 attend (Schorr, 1988).

As a society, it is to our benefit to assure that _all_ young children have access to high quality early childhood experiences that will give them a good start to success, not just in school but as contributing members of society. Yet publicly supported access to such programs is limited; most preschool programs rely on parent fees as a primary funding source. Head Start, it is estimated, serves only 18% of eligible children. While the number of state-funded programs for at-risk children has grown rapidly in recent years, these programs too fall far short of the need. Also, many of the programs targeted to economically disadvantaged children operate only on a part-day basis, making it difficult for families most in need of work to arrange for child care.

Let me stress this last point, for we cannot divorce children's needs for high quality educational expericences from many parents' needs for child care. Attempts to consider child care and early childhood education as separate entities are harmful to children, and the results of noncoordination can be costly and frustrating both to families and to policymakers. Let me also note in this regard that we must consider care and education needs of all young children. Senator Kennedy, you have repeatedly said that you do not see Smart Start as an alternative to a comprehensive child care bill like ABC. I would reiterate the importance of ABC here today. For while addressing the needs of 4-year-olds is important, we cannot overlook the full early childhood age range and the fact that in many communities, the most pressing needs are for infant and school-age child care.

As we talk about the importance of not separating care and education for young children, often people will say, but we don't want 4-year-olds sitting at desks listening to the teacher. To that I say, neither do we! NAEYC firmly believes that education must be tailored to the age and needs of the children served. Teaching 4-year-olds is as different from teaching 7-year-olds as teaching junior high school students differs than teaching college. In fact, the distinctions may be greater with younger children because of rapid changes in the ways that children think which occur between the preschool and early elementary years.

In the early years, the most important determinant of program quality is what happens between teachers and students. Frankly, specific behaviors of individual teachers are not easily "legislatable," but you can legislate requirements that maximize the likelihood that children will receive a high quality educational experience. Particularly important is assuring that sufficient numbers of well-trained teachers are available. The 1:10 staff-child ratio and maximum group size of 20 which are specified in the Smart Start legislation are within the limits recommended in NAEYC's Criteria for High Quality Early Childhood Programs. The Criteria, ~~which~~ serve as the basis for our accreditation process to recognize high quality programs, recommend a staff-child ratio ranging from 1:8 to 1:10 and group size between 16 and 20 for 4-year-olds.

But assuring good numbers is only a part of the picture. Specialized staff training in early childhood education is critical. Again, we cannot expect to teach 4-year-olds the same way we teach children at age 6. Preschool children learn best by doing. They need to have a wide range of materials and activities relevant to their own lives and experiences. What is most educational for a 4-year old looks suspiciously like play: using building blocks, water and sand, dictating stories, etc. The teacher acts less like an instructor and more like a facilitator or guide. In high quality programs you won't see children sitting at desks doing worksheets; instead, you'll see small groups of children actively engaged in the pursuit of knowledge--asking "why" and then figuring out how to ways to find out answers; learning how to get along with other children, beginning to recognize another's point of view, and learning that different ways of doing something can still be right; and most importantly, learning that school is a fun place where you can be successful. These are the lessons--which much more than worksheets--

can provide the basis for success in later school years. For as we all quickly learn (sometimes to our dismay) adulthood is simply not a series of fill-in-the-blank options.

It takes much skill and understanding to know how to teach young children in what we call a developmentally appropriate manner. Teachers of young children need to understand how children grow and develop and how to structure the classroom environment to respond to their needs. Without specialized training, staff too often base their definition of teaching on activities better suited to older children. In such situations children too often learn the unfortunate, but powerful, lesson: that they aren't good students. In fact, the real lesson is that an inappropriate program isn't good for children.

As important as teachers with specialized skill and knowledge are to assuring high quality programs, this is a difficult provision to assure. The field of early childhood education is facing a serious problem in recruiting and retaining qualified staff. This is a primarily a result of the inadequate levels of compensation provided to teachers of young children. Most early childhood programs are community-based and depend on parent fees as a primary income source. But most family budgets are already overstretched by child care costs, so that increases in personnel costs cannot be borne only by parents. For years, early childhood staff have subsidized the provision of early childhood programs by accepting salaries and benefits far below the value of their work and not receiving compensation reflective of their educational status or level of experience. It is a shameful commentary on our society that this situation exists--and in fact is worsening.

We must take action to stem what has in some programs become a revolving door of personnel. Children learn best when they have developed close, warm relationships with others, particularly adults. Trusting relationships with teachers are essential if young children are to thrive and learn in out-of-home settings. Secure trusting relationships are especially important for children's long-term emotional development. Children who do not have the security that comes with these trusting relationships often grow up to be suspicious, uncaring, even hostile people who are afraid to try anything new. Children who learn early in life that people can be trusted are more likely to grow up to be confident, secure adults who respect themselves and others and are able to form healthy emotional attachments.

Smart Start recognizes the importance of training and the links between training and compensation; a defined purpose of the bill is to assist state and local governments in providing training for early childhood staff and promoting the use of salary scales that reflect training and experience.

Another key ingredient of assuring good programs for young children is maintaining close relationships between parents and teachers. Studies that document the long-term effectiveness of preschool programs point to those that actively involve parents. Early childhood programs can provide family support in a variety of ways--from information on child development and child-rearing to help in locating needed community resources. Parents who are involved with their children's early childhood experiences typically take a greater interest in their child's education throughout their school career.

In addition to essential characteristics of high quality programs, it is important to consider how new programs fit into the existing range of services provided to young children and their families. There is a long and distinguished tradition of both public and private services for young children and their families. Given the tremendous need for services that exists, particular care must be given in both planning and implementation stages to avoid overlap and duplication of services. Coordination of services at all levels is essential. Resources are too desperately needed within the field to spend money on reinventing the wheel. Early childhood care and education services have often been described as a patchwork arrangement. We need to look for strategies that can support the richness of diversity within this system while building a coherent whole; we should avoid putting in place structures that may cause further fragmentation.

NAEYC firmly believes that investments in high quality programs for young children and their families are investments that will yield many times their costs. For too long our children have been the recipients of rhetoric and politicians' kisses. As a nation we must come to grips with the fact that if we ignore the needs of our youngest citizens, we will have failed an entire generation of citizens and placed the future of this nation at risk. NAEYC's members stand ready to work with this committee to assure that all young children have access to the high quality programs they need and deserve.

Public Policy Report

The following position statement was adopted by the NAEYC Governing Board at their November 1986 meeting. We urge you to use these guidelines as your state considers legislation to expand or create new early childhood programs, and to share feedback concerning their implementation. Your help will allow NAEYC to collect data concerning the use of these guidelines in various state initiatives, and will provide valuable information for the development of additional or revised guidelines.

Guidelines for Developing Legislation Creating or Expanding Programs for Young Children

A POSITION STATEMENT OF THE
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE EDUCATION OF YOUNG CHILDREN

Introduction

More and more states are showing interest in providing funds to create or expand early childhood programs. A growing number of states have initiated publicly funded early childhood programs in recent years, and other states are considering legislation to establish such programs. Such interest is well founded. Early childhood programs can be of central importance to policies for improving education, reforming welfare policy, or stimulating economic development in a state.

From the perspective of education, legislators and citizens wish to improve schools. A number of national reports have been released documenting current problems with our educational system and suggesting strategies for change. Early childhood programs are frequently among the prescriptive measures suggested, and with good reason. Research has clearly documented the beneficial effects of high quality early childhood programs, particularly for children deemed vulnerable for later school failure. Children attending high quality early childhood programs have been found to have greater self-confidence and self-esteem, to be more likely to complete high school and continue their education, and to be less likely to be placed in remedial classes. (For an overview of these and other findings, see Howes, 1986.) Moreover, high quality early childhood programs are cost-effective. In one program, it was estimated that every $1 invested led to a return of $4.75 in savings as a result of lower special education costs, lower welfare costs, and higher worker productivity as the children matured (Weikart, 1983).

From the perspective of welfare and job training for parents, provisions for early childhood programs remove a major stumbling block for parental employment, thus reducing welfare costs and promoting self-sufficiency over time. High quality child care arrangements that meet families' needs can also make it easier for parents to stay on the job. Research clearly shows the links between parents' lower productivity and missed days of work and unsatisfactory child care arrangements. Finally, the provision of early childhood programs can stimulate economic development. Employers who provide financial support to early childhood programs and support services are quick to report positive results—a competitive edge in recruiting skilled employees and improved job performance and productivity because of lower absenteeism, reduced turnover, and less anxiety by parents.

No matter what the incentive for creating or expanding early childhood programs—whether to improve education, reduce welfare rolls, or stimulate economic development—there are a number of common denominators to consider as programs are designed and implemented. Problems may arise if programs are developed with consideration to only one perspective. For example, a program designed to provide enrichment experiences for children at risk for school failure may exacerbate parents' problems of locating or retaining employment if the program is scheduled on a part-day basis with no consideration given to parents' need to provide supplemental care during the full workday. This is particularly critical given the fact that children deemed at risk are likely to have parents who would benefit from assistance to obtain and retain employment.

Similarly, early childhood programs designed strictly from the perspective of welfare reform or economic development must not overlook the importance of addressing each child's right to a sound program that provides appropriate educational and social experiences geared to the age of the child. Programs designed *only* to meet parents' need to provide for their children while they work can lead to negative outcomes for children. High quality programs that meet children's developmental needs result in a wiser investment of public dollars because of their long-term cost effectiveness.

The National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) welcomes current public interest in early childhood programs. For the investment of public dollars to be most effective, high quality programs must be provided. The NAEYC suggests the following questions be used as yardsticks when legislation to create new or expand existing programs for young children and their families is considered, to assure that high quality programs for young children and their families are implemented.

Guidelines

Provision of program standards to assure quality programs

1. Does the legislation spell out a process for developing and effectively implementing standards that ensure the safety and well-being of the children served, while promoting their healthy development?
   a. If the process is the state's licensing system, does the licensing office have adequate staffing to handle the expansion and are the standards adequate to accomplish the purposes of the legislation?
   b. If the process is *not* licensing because programs may be delivered primarily through public agencies, does the legislation include wording to assure that the new programs will be at least equal to or surpass in quality programs licensed by the state?
   c. When standards are developed, does the legislation assure that program standards address each of the following areas:
      - staff qualifications,
      - parent role,
      - group size and staff-child ratios,
      - discipline, and
      - developmentally appropriate practice?*
   d. Does the legislation assure that there will be a system for implementing the standards that include monitoring and inspections?
2. Does the legislation require that an advisory committee, composed in part of members with early childhood expertise, approve the program standards once developed?
3. Does the legislation assure that the appropriate use of evaluation instruments and procedures are addressed within the program standards?
   a. Are decisions regarding enrollment, retention, and placement in special classes based primarily on observations by parents and qualified professionals, rather than on a single test score?
   b. Is developmental assessment of children's progress and achievement used to plan curriculum, identify children with special needs, communicate with parents, and evaluate the program's effectiveness?

Parental access and involvement

1. Does the legislation provide opportunities for families to make informed choices concerning the program they want for their child? (e.g., Can parents choose either home-based child care or a center-based program? Can parents choose a school near their work site as well as near their home?)
2. Does the legislation assure the establishment of close ties between program staff and children's families?
   a. Are staff required to inform parents or guardians of the program's philosophy and operating procedures?
   b. Are parents provided with ongoing opportunities to discuss their children's needs and progress with program staff?
   c. Are parent representatives included as members of pertinent advisory groups?
   d. Do parents have unrestricted access to the program facility?
3. Does the legislation make provision for a variety of family needs, including those of working families, by allowing the funding of full-day programs (covering the average parent's working day) as well as part-day programs?

Eligibility for service

1. Is the long-term goal of the legislation to provide services to all children? If the legislation or available resources restrict service provision, is the target group the most needy?
2. Will the legislation extend eligibility to previously unserved or underserved groups (e.g., teenage parents, families who would be poor without subsidized early childhood programs)?
3. Does the legislation facilitate a socioeconomic mix of children in programs through the use of such mechanisms as sliding fee scales and other funding sources?

---

* See *Accreditation Criteria of the National Academy of Early Childhood Programs* (NAEYC, 1984) and *Developmentally Appropriate Practice* (Bredekamp, 1986) and *Good Teaching Practices for 4- and 5-Year-Olds* (NAEYC, 1986). These NAEYC position statements may be referenced in law or standards or they may serve to guide advisory groups' writing standards.

Linkages and coordination

1. Does the legislation provide the administering agency flexibility to fund a variety of public and private community agencies that demonstrate the ability to provide high quality early childhood services?
2. Does the legislation encourage or require programs to make linkages with other funding sources in order to serve more children (e.g., in-kind contributions, parent fees, coordinative agreements, and matching funds from private and public sources)?
3. Does the legislation encourage collaboration among the various agencies whose programs affect young children and their families (e.g., legislative creation of an Interagency Committee or other such mechanism to assure coordination of service provision for young children and their families)?
4. Does the legislation contribute to the overall provision of services for young children and avoid duplicating existing public or private programs?

Provision of professional expertise

1. Does the legislation require programs to employ persons with early childhood professional expertise at all stages of development and implementation and does it assure adequate compensation for those who work with young children?
2. Are advisory groups that include members of the early childhood profession as well as parent and community representatives legislatively created at both the state and program level?
3. Are the staff responsible for implementation in the administering agency and at the program level required to have specialized training related to the age of children served and work experience with this age group?

Funding

1. Will the legislation provide adequate funds per child to assure program quality and permit adequate compensation for staff?
2. Are funds tied to continued effort to meet standards?
3. Will the legislation provide for increased funding reflective of the cost of living?

Adopted November 1986

Additional Resources

NAEYC has adopted several position statements pertinent to these guidelines. It is suggested that they serve as additional references when legislative measures that include early childhood programs are considered.

Bredekamp, S. (Ed.). (1986). *Developmentally appropriate practice.* Washington, DC: NAEYC.

National Association for the Education of Young Children. (1982). *Early childhood teacher education guidelines for 4- and 5-year programs.* Washington, DC: NAEYC.

National Association for the Education of Young Children. (1984). *Accreditation criteria and procedures of the National Academy of Early Childhood Programs.* Washington, DC: NAEYC.

National Association for the Education of Young Children. (1984). *NAEYC position statement on nomenclature, salaries, benefits, and the status of the early childhood profession.* Washington, DC: NAEYC.

National Association for the Education of Young Children. (1984). *NAEYC position statements on child care licensing and family day care regulation.* Washington, DC: NAEYC.

National Association for the Education of Young Children. (1985). *Guidelines for early childhood education programs in associate degree granting institutions.* Washington, DC: NAEYC.

National Association for the Education of Young Children. (1986). *Good teaching practices for 4- and 5-year olds.* Washington, DC: NAEYC.

References

Howes, C. (1986). *Keeping current in child care research: An annotated bibliography.* Washington, DC: NAEYC.

Weikart, D. P. (1983). Testimony before the U.S. House of Representatives Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families. In *Prevention strategies for healthy babies and healthy children.* Hearing before the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, June 30, 1983. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Copyright © 1987 by the National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Please inform NAEYC if you make copies to share with parents, teachers, or students, for library reserve, or for personal use so that we will know which articles are most valuable to our readers. This copyright notice must appear with each copy you make. If you do not have access to a copier, single copies of this article are available for $2 from NAEYC, 1834 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20009-5786.

Permission to reprint is required only if this material is to be reprinted in another form such as a book, newsletter, or journal. Request permission from NAEYC in writing.

The **Chairman**. Thank you very much.

Ms. Bentley?

STATEMENT OF ROSEANN BENTLEY, PRESIDENT, MISSOURI STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION, SPRINGFIELD, MO, PRESIDENT-ELECT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION

Ms. **Bentley**. I will try to keep mine right at five minutes.

Good morning, Mr. Chairman. My name is Roseann Bentley, President of the Missouri State Board of Education and also President-Elect of National Association of State Boards of Education, which we call NASBE. It is a non-profit association serving State Boards of Education.

I am delighted to be here to talk about Smart Start this morning. Before I begin, I want to commend you personally for your strong interest in this crucial area.

As we are all aware, dramatic increases in the number of working parents, single-parent households and teen parents has created a critical need for comprehensive quality early childhood programs.

This year, a major organizational activity for our association has been the creation of a National Early Childhood Education Task Force. This task force recently has held hearings all over the country, specifically in Atlanta, Chicago, Boston and San Francisco. We heard from more than 150 State policymakers, parents, teachers, and program managers. They gave us such a rich understanding of the depth of the problems and the urgency of this legislation. This fall, our task force will draft a report which will make a number of policy recommendations for State boards and other policymakers to improve the quality of preschool and early education programs for children four through eight.

On the basis of what we learned from this task force, I would like to address a number of provisions in Smart Start, some that we think are exceptionally well designed and others that perhaps in our view could be improved as the legislation progresses.

Perhaps the most important aspect as we see it is the strong incentives for State and local collaboration in the delivery of services to preschool children. The legislation recognizes that most communities participate in Head Start, child care, and preschool programs for children with special needs, as well as State early childhood initiatives. Each of these programs has different standards, funding criteria, and delivery mechanisms. Your proposed State Interagency Advisory Task Forces and Local Policy Groups would provide a badly needed forum for joint planning and coordination among these programs. More importantly, Smart Start virtually forces collaboration by promising enough new funding to make it very worthwhile for public schools, Head Start, and child care providers and the private sector.

In our hearings, we heard testimony on the issue of collaboration. We were impressed with State initiatives, such as those of Massachusetts and South Carolina, to coordinate the efforts of State agencies involved in early childhood programs. And we heard wonderful examples from Murray, Kentucky, for example, and in Brighton, Massachusetts, which are combining resources from different State, Federal and local agencies along with contributions from higher ed.

However, we also heard significant examples of lacks of communication and tensions that exist between public schools, Head Start and child care agencies. NASBE's view is that each of these agencies has much to learn from each other. For instance, public schools can learn a lot from Head Start in the area of parental involvement. Head Start and public schools can learn a lot from day care centers about moving from half-day into full-day. And certainly, we need all to work together to provide smoother transitions from preschool into kindergarten.

As a State board member, I am especially pleased that Smart Start recognizes State initiative and leadership in the area of early childhood education. Rather than attempting to impose a new uniform Federal program, Smart Start builds on the active efforts of 23 States which have already begun preschool initiatives in the 1980's.

For example, recognizing that parents play a key role in the early childhood enterprises, States such as my own, Missouri, and Minnesota, have placed parents in the forefront as the primary educational delivery system for young children. It is never by substituting programs for parents, but by empowering and working through parents that we can significantly hope to alter lives of disadvantaged children. Smart Start recognizes important State initiatives in parent education and support systems by allowing States to provide and expand services.

Smart Start also draws on research and program experience from the past two decades to outline high quality standards. Further, Smart Start provides funds to expand existing preschool programs to full-day. With the increasing trends toward working parents and likelihood of welfare reform initiatives which will mandate training and employment participation for recipients of public assistance, the majority of preschool children need a high quality program available all day.

As exceptional as Smart Start is, it does contain some provisions NASBE feels might be improved. We believe that the bill's strong collaboration incentives and quality standards could be enhanced. Specifically, we would recommend replacing the allocation of community funding currently based on formulas to an allocation based on a review of proposals by the State Interagency Task Force. These would be based, in turn, on the quality criteria.

In addition, Smart Start could go further in recognizing State initiative in early childhood legislation by ensuring that leadership States, which have already begun some early childhood programs, are not penalized by requiring them to make another sizable contribution to qualify for Smart Start. Although Smart Start does include a waiver provision for States unable to meet the initial requirement, it should also contain a proportional credit provision for States which have already set aside funds for early childhood programs.

Finally, NASBE recommends that the sensitive decision concerning the lead State agency be made by the Governor as currently required in the bill, but without a recommendation from the State Interagency Task Force. It is NASBE's view that because the Governor must make the final determination, parochial interests represented with the State task force may only serve to complicate and slow down the process. We also encourage lay participation at the State level in decisions affecting administration.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I wish to underscore the critical need for a significant quality early childhood education program, such as Smart Start. NASBE firmly believes that anything substantially less will only dilute funding for existing quality programs.

We would also urge that the committee continue to look at the child care needs of working parents and consider through other legislation the needs of younger children and other types of child care needs, particularly those of low-income women who may not have traditional nine-to-five jobs.

James Agee has written, "With every child who is born under no matter what circumstances, the potentiality of the human race is born again." We cannot afford to waste this potential.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Bentley follows:]

TESTIMONY OF ROSEANN BENTLEY
ON "SMART START"
ON BEHALF OF THE
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION
BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

JUNE 10, 1988
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Good morning, Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the Committee. My name is Roseann Bentley, and I am president of the Missouri State Board of Education. I am also an officer of the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE), a non-profit association serving state boards of education, the nation's highest-ranking citizen trustees for the public interest in education. As a state board member and as a member of NASBE, I am delighted to be here this morning to discuss S. 2270, the "Smart Start" bill.

Before I begin, I would like to commend the sponsors of this important legislation, and specifically, to thank the Chairman for his strong leadership in the crucial area of early childhood education.

As we are all aware, dramatic increases in the number of women in the workforce, single parent households, and teenage parents have created a critical need for comprehensive quality early childhood programs, particularly to serve at-risk youth. Especially important are preschool programs which meet the needs of working parents, and which are also aimed at meeting the developmental and educational needs of preschool children and enhancing the likelihood of their later school success.

This year, a major organizational activity for NASBE has been the establishment of a National Early Childhood Education Task Force, comprised of twenty-one individuals, including many early childhood experts, that is studying the various aspects of early childhood programs. An example of the active public/private interest in early education today, NASBE's Task Force is being sponsored by the Administration on Children, Youth and Families, the Exxon Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

The Task Force recently held regional hearings in Atlanta, Chicago, Boston and San Francisco, where we heard from more than 150 state policymakers, parents, teachers and program managers, who have given us a rich understanding of the problems which this legislation addresses. This fall, the Task Force will draft a report which will make a number of policy recommendations for state boards and other policymakers to improve the quality of preschool and early elementary programs for children ages 4 to 8.

On the basis of what NASBE has learned from its Task Force, I would like to address a number of provisions in Smart Start, including some which appear to be extremely well-designed, and others which, in our view, might be improved as the legislation progresses.

Perhaps the most important and well-designed aspect of Smart Start is that it offers exceptionally strong incentives for state and local collaboration in the delivery of services to preschool children. The legislation recognizes that most communities participate in federally-funded Head Start, child-care, and preschool programs for children with special needs, as well as state early childhood initiatives. Each of these programs has different standards, funding criteria and delivery mechanisms. The proposed State Interagency Advisory Task Forces and Local Policy Groups in Smart Start would provide a badly needed forum for joint planning and coordination among these programs. More important, Smart Start virtually forces collaboration by promising enough new funding to make working together truly worthwhile for public schools, Head Start, child-care providers and the private sector.

NASBE's Task Force hearings have included considerable testimony on the issue of collaboration. We were impressed with state initiatives, such as those of Massachusetts and South Carolina, to coordinate efforts of state agencies involved in early childhood programs; and with innovative local projects, such as the Murray Kentucky Head Start Program and the Early Learning Center in Brighton, Massachusetts, which are combining resources from different state, federal and local agencies along with contributions from higher education institutions.

However, our Early Childhood Task Force has also heard significant examples of lack of communication and tensions among public schools, Head Start and child-care agencies. NASBE's view is that each of these agencies has much to learn from and much to contribute to the other. For example, public schools can benefit from the experience of Head Start programs in successfully involving parents; child-care programs can assist Head Start and public schools in moving from part-day schedules to full-day operations; and public schools can assist early childhood agencies in providing a smooth transition for children and parents from their preschool experience into kindergarten programs.

Mr. Chairman, as a state board member, I am especially pleased that Smart Start recognizes state initiative and leadership in the area of early childhood education. Rather than attempting to impose a new uniform federal program on states and localities, Smart Start builds on the active efforts of twenty-three states which have begun new initiatives in the 1980s to provide preschool, child-care, and parent education services through public schools, Head Start and other community-based agencies.

For example, recognizing that parents play a key role in the early childhood enterprise, states such as Missouri and Minnesota have placed parents in the forefront as the primary educational delivery system for young children by providing them with timely information and support. As a result, even traditional "at-risk" parents have been found to become astute observers of their children and knowledgeable in ways to positively impact the development of their children. It is not by substituting programs for parents, but by empowering and working through parents that the lives of disadvantaged children will be significantly improved. Smart Start recognizes these important state initiatives in parent education and support systems by allowing states to provide and expand such services under this legislation.

Smart Start also draws on research and program experience from the past two decades to outline high quality standards for new programs. We have learned from hard work and careful study of initiatives such as Project Head Start and the Perry Preschool Program that successful programs must involve parents, employ staff who are well-trained in a developmental approach to curriculum and teaching, and complement the educational program for children with health, nutrition, and social services for students and their families.

Further, Smart Start wisely provides funds to expand existing preschool programs to full-day schedules to meet the needs of working parents. Many state programs and Head Start centers have limited their services to part-day in order to serve as many children as possible with limited funds. However, with the increasing trends towards working parents and the likelihood of welfare reform initiatives which will mandate training and employment participation for recipients of public assistance, the majority of preschool children need a high quality program which is available all day.

As exceptional as Smart Start is, it contains a few provisions NASBE feels might be improved. First, NASBE believes the bill's strong collaboration incentives and quality standards for programs could be enhanced. Specifically, NASBE recommends replacing the allocation of community funding currently based on formulas, to an allocation based on a review of proposals by the State Interagency Task Force, which would be based in turn on the quality criteria. The result, we believe, would be to give real clout to collaboration, as well as to provide stronger incentives for local programs to meet the quality standards.

In addition, Smart Start could go further in recognizing state initiative in early childhood legislation by ensuring that leadership states, which have recently set aside substantial resources for early childhood education programs, aren't in effect penalized by requiring them to make another sizeable contribution to qualify for Smart Start. For example, the state of Texas has recently set aside $40 million for a state preschool education program. Although Smart Start does currently include a waiver provision for states initially unable to meet the required match, it should also contain a proportional credit provision for states like Texas, which have already set aside funds for early childhood programs.

Finally, NASBE recommends that the sensitive decision concerning the lead state agency be made by the Governor, as currently required in the bill, but without a recommendation from the State Interagency Task Force. It is NASBE's view that because the Governor must make the final decision in any event, parochial interests represented within the State Task Force will serve only to complicate and slow down the process in many states of choosing a lead state agency. Accordingly, the State Task Force should not recommend the lead state agency. NASBE also strongly encourages lay participation at the state level in decisions affecting the administration of Smart Start.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I wish to underscore the critical need for a significant quality early childhood education program, such as Smart Start. NASBE firmly believes that anything substantially less than Smart Start, in its objectives or funding, is unlikely to work and will serve only to dilute funding for existing quality programs.

If, as we hope, Congress moves forward to enact this legislation, NASBE hopes Congress will also undertake efforts to review existing and new early childhood education programs, such as Head Start, state programs and Smart Start, to help states make sense out of early childhood programs as they are structured.

Finally, recognizing that Smart Start represents an important first step in meeting the child-care needs of working parents, NASBE urges this Committee to begin considering, through other legislation, the needs of younger children and other types of child-care needs, particularly those of low-income women, who may not have traditional nine-to-five jobs.

Thank you again, Mr. Chairman, for your leadership and for the opportunity to testify before you this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

I am going to ask Amanda Broun, who is our counsel, to inquire of you. I have to make a presentation to the Armed Services Committee.

What I would like to do is get your sense about the matching funds. Is it realistic? The greatest need is among needy and poor people, which I think has been amply demonstrated.

Realistically, do you really think we are going to be able to get funding at the local level or at the State level to match whatever we do at the Federal level? Could you talk a little bit about that? Obviously, we have a different arrangement with regard to the Head Start program. One of the purposes of this program is to try and leverage State funds, get them more active.

Maybe you would each take a crack at that. We will get it in the record, and I will ask Amanda if she would chair the hearing. I would like to get your reactions to this question. Then she may have one or two other questions. Then we will recess, and I will be back in about a half hour.

Ms. BROUN [presiding]. Let us start with the first question that the Senator just raised, and I will throw it open. If any or all of you could address the issue of whether or not the States and localities will be able to come up with the funding that is required in the statute; that is, the match.

Ms. BENTLEY. I will take the first crack at it. As you all understand, education is almost always under-funded. And funds will be difficult to find. However, I think that it is clear that the recognition of the urgent need is there. I think that States will try to find the money to do this.

It will not be easy, but I think the case can be made strongly enough in a collaborative effort. This is another reason that the collaboration is so important for the strong voices within the communities to be heard to urge the funding through the State agencies.

Ms. WILLER. I would just reiterate that I think that the scope of the problem is so great that funds need to come from all different sources. We have heard a lot today about public and private partnerships and the role of leveraging.

I think that if programs are to be supported adequately, we need to develop ways of accessing sources from all potential sources, and recognizing that good programs not only benefit families and children, but they are a benefit to the community as well as the Nation as a whole.

Certainly, some States will have more difficulties than others, and if there are ways of building on this and recognition of the importance of this, I think that can help.

Ms. JENKINS. Well, first of all, I would like to say that we feel the Federal Government must assume its responsibility along these lines, and we are very cognizant that yesterday the Senate Appropriations cut education funding by, I believe, $500 million. We really need to have more in the way of support from the Federal Government.

I guess I am particularly sensitive to this, being from California. State PTA was part of a coalition that tried to revise what we have, an expenditure limit, which many of you probably know as the GANN limit. I attended a wake where we watched our efforts not quite make it.

What is good about the loss is it was so narrow, and we think after many years, 13 years of Jarvis and GANN, that perhaps the voters are beginning to be sensitive to the need to adjust their expenditure limit.

That is a lead-in for me to say that I believe a program such as you are doing may give added pressure for those of us at the State level to say: "Where is the money in our State that will enable us to participate and get our fair share of this Federal program?" Anything we can do to leverage the mentality that we have in some State legislatures and in some of the voting public is what we need to have from you, with, first of all, the Federal Government being willing to model that this is a need, and give leadership to this kind of program.

We are going through a cutting-edge period of where our country is having to acknowledge that child care is no longer going to be the responsibility of the mother that is at home. My three sons tell me I am an anachronism of the past because I stayed home and raised them. I am now working very hard to make sure that their children, my grandchildren, will have quality day care all day long if that is what our family is going to have to do.

Ms. BROUN. Thank you.

I am going to go through a few more questions and then adjourn for a few minutes. When Senator Kennedy returns, which we expect at quarter of 10:00, we will go to the third panel, which will be Commissioner Tirozzi and Ms. Eugenia Boggus.

Ms. Bentley, you indicated in your testimony that the waiver of the non-Federal share should be strengthened for States which have already made a substantial commitment in early childhood education. Can you elaborate specifically on the proportional credit notion that you raise? How exactly would that work?

Ms. BENTLEY. Our thought was that for a State such as Texas which has set aside $40 million for early childhood education, that Smart Start might consider taking a look at making an allowance; depending on the amount that the State has put in and comparing that with what the requirement would be through Smart Start—for instance, if it was more than what Smart Start would require, then they would not owe anything. But if it were less than what would have been the initial requirement for Smart Start, they would pay up to the remaining amount.

Also, it would have to have the years considered into it so that the waiver could not go on forever, or the allowance, the proportional credit could not go on for an un-ending time. It would be based on the greater number of years the funding was allocated, the less credit a State would receive. That would assure that a State would not receive credit forever. But it would recognize that they should not be penalized because they jumped on this and saw this critical need before Federal legislation was forthcoming.

Ms. BROUN. It sounds like it would essentially require relinquishing the supplement, not supplant provisions. We would like to continue to work on that notion with you. I think we would need to look at something in between. It is clear that since States have done a fair amount in this area we could use up the entire Federal allocation by relinquishing the supplement, not supplant provision. Then we would be leveraging no additional State and local funding, which is one of the key purposes of the legislation.

There should perhaps be some greater deference given to those States that have already contributed significantly. So we need to work on that further.

Ms. **Bentley**. We look forward to working with you closely on that aspect of the bill.

Ms. **Broun**. Dr. Willer, we would like to use Smart Start as a way to improve training and salaries, in particular, and to build a professional career ladder in the child care field. This seems to be a goal of your organization, clearly.

What can we do to improve Smart Start along those lines, to ensure that that goal is accomplished?

Ms. **Willer**. Well, I think that some of the things that are in the bill do that quite well in terms of both the training requirements and allocating money for training as a part of the funding that goes to States. I would raise a caution, however, and I think this is something we are seeing as programs come in throughout the States. That is, again, knowing that there are a number of programs that are operating within the communities. As public-funded programs come in, if they act as a drain to teaching staff, it can be a very serious problem in terms of what local communities are sometimes facing.

We need to look for ways both as we are implementing the career ladder, and one that is absolutely essential in building in opportunities, we also need to strengthen our recruitment and work to ways that can facilitate funding for programs who are within the community sector as well so that we maintain access to high quality trained staff for all children.

Ms. **Broun**. Thank you.

Ms. Jenkins, is it preferable to require that early childhood education services be provided directly, or should we permit services to be provided by a voucher process, in your view?

Ms. **Jenkins**. The National PTA and, I would believe, every State affiliate PTA does not want to see any voucher system ever perpetrated by the Federal Government. This is just something that, once it starts, will go on and on and on; because if it is valid for one age level, grade level, that same argument could be made for every other age level and grade level. There are too many ways that parents can be taken advantage of by people who sell that their system, their program is the best because suddenly you have put all of this into strictly a commercial arena.

We witnessed garage schools in the valley when desegregation caused white flight from Los Angeles. And the programs that parents subjected their children to were inexcusable.

Ms. **Broun**. Okay. Ms. Bentley, in your testimony, you suggest that the lead State agency should be chosen by the Governor without the recommendation of the State Interagency Task Force because of the political complications that the Task Force might bring. Some would argue that leaving the decision up to the Governor alone is also political, or even more political than having a recommendation from the balanced group.

I wonder if you would comment on that.

Ms. Bentley. One of our thoughts was that it is very important for that Interagency Task Force Advisory Committee to start off on a very positive note, and this could be a very divisive thing. The Governor will ultimately make the decision. So in the interest of reducing the amount of conflicts initially, we felt that the collaborative effort might be more successful if it was just placed directly into the Governor's hands.

Schools are clearly most appropriate and effective for meeting the educational needs of children. But we feel that the collaborative nature of this enterprise would require that the Governor take on this task.

Ms. Broun. Dr. Willer, can you comment on the collaborations at the State and local levels and how you feel they will be successful, if you do, and whether or not we have been successful in implementing the NAEYC's guidelines generally?

Ms. Willer. I think that the coordination at both State and local levels is absolutely essential for all the reasons I have said. One of the most important is that, again, the provision of early childhood programs has crossed many lines, both in terms of funding streams and service providers. And so many people feel that they have a stake in this issue, as well they do. And if parties representing those various interests can be involved in both the planning as well as the implementation stages, I think we can hopefully avoid some of the problems that might arise if the programs are seen as favoring one versus another interest.

So, again, we have created, in many cases by default, but we have in place this patchwork arrangement that is servicing children, certainly not nearly as well as it needs to. But we have a system in place, and we need to build upon that system and strengthen it and work to build it together rather than to cause further fragmentation.

Ms. Broun. Ms. Jenkins, in your view, in the way the Interagency Task Force is structured at the local level, do parents have a sufficient degree of input into the issues to be decided by that task force?

Ms. Jenkins. As you have it in your bill?

Ms. Broun. Yes.

Ms. Jenkins. I do not know. You would perhaps have to strengthen that part of the language as well. What I am very cognizant about is that in some areas the program that you are talking about at the local level will have parents that are not used to working within the system, and they would need a great deal of support. That is why I emphasized strengthening the language in one section, first of all, about parent education programs being offered, not just wherever possible. But in watching the Advisory Councils in my school district, I sense that to have parents really give viable suggestions and help make decisions, you have to have adequate time for them to understand and be educated to what is going on and what is really a strong program.

Too often, we use our parents just as a sign-off, and they are really not worked with in an adequate manner. On that, we would support working with you in any way possible to define it so that those parents are given the necessary support services to participate on equal footing with the other people on the task force.

I would like say, if you do not mind, that we really support the State level task force because right now in my own State, the Governor is reaching out to have this policy committee made up of representatives from all of the agencies at the State level. And it became very apparent at our first meeting that every one of the people around the room, no matter where they were—and this was a K–12 problem we were addressing—said intervention had to start before kindergarten. They were all acknowledging the need for the intervention that you are laying out here in Smart Start. Plus the fact they all asked for ways to have statute language or any barriers that might have inadvertently occurred removed so that they could work together so they could go out into the schools at the local level.

I am not certain what has caused these problems, but I was pleased to hear the discussion at the first meeting of this group. And I think that kind of working together could occur at the State level in most States.

Ms. **Broun**. Just picking up on your earlier point, we are very cognizant of the concern of ensuring that parents are involved, not simply in terms of having access to the classroom and to the curriculum and meetings with teachers and so on, but to be sure that they are really involved in the governmental structure, the governance of the program.

I guess I would address this to you, but throw it open to anyone: What is the best way for us to strike a balance between making sure that parents are empowered, if you will, at the local level and at the same time ensuring that they do have the guidance and support that they need to work within the system, as you say, which can be overwhelming when we are talking about school boards and departments of social services and so on?

Ms. **Jenkins**. I would like to say I was a lay person elected to our local school board. I was a much better school board member as I exited after 12 years than I was in my first year, because it took a great deal for me to begin to understand the nuances of what was effective instructional methodology, effective leadership by the administration, and effective governance.

I do not sense that we give the time for parents in our advisory communities to learn that. If you strengthen your parent education components, I would almost like to say mandate that parents attend at least a number of parent education offerings, then they will begin to understand what is good and effective in working with their children. Then they will begin to have a more valid opinion and be able to vote in an intelligent manner, not just because the teacher who they may stand in awe of says this is the way to go.

Ms. **Broun**. And the parent education would be on how the system works—is that the thrust of it—so that they know how to deal with the other components?

Ms. **Jenkins**. Not only would they have to learn what is good for children, as the lady from NAEYC has said, but also the parameters in which the system operates. We are talking about trying to find ways to bring in other support services to this program from other agencies. That begins to take a lot of sensitivity to what goes on.

Again, you would have to provide time for those parents to be given the education necessary to be a viable part of the decisionmaking process.

Ms. **Bentley**. I'd like to respond also. Because of this rich experience I've had at these Regional Task Forces which NASBE has sponsored, and the stories that we heard from mothers who had been enabled and empowered through Head Start were truly remarkable.

One woman from rural Wisconsin spoke of being left by her husband with five small children. And through Head Start and its parent education component, she was able to go ahead and complete her education because it gave her the materials that she needed, not only to help her children but to enrich her own life. And she had a very remarkable success story.

But we heard it over and over again. I think Missouri and Minnesota's attempt to reach parents early—parents are at their most susceptible when the baby is first born. And so I would think that the support early for parents and involving them in knowing that they are their most important first teacher of their child, and then helping them to understand the system and work through.

We already have models for this that have been very successful in special education with parents empowered there to sign the IEPs and to work in a more close counseling situation for the needs of their special education children. And I think we could learn a lot from that area too.

Ms. **Broun**. Dr. Willer.

Ms. **Willer**. I would just reiterate that I think one of the legacies of Head Start has been the degree of success that they've had in terms of parental involvement and meaningful involvement. I think that's really a key to look at this as both a support of service and ways for active and meaningful involvement. Parents are critical players in this endeavor. And their views and perspectives need to be recognized as such.

And sometimes when we think of parent education, we think again in a developmentally inappropriate fashion so that we're lecturing to parents. And we need to look for ways of making parents truly partners and involved in this.

The other comment I would make is that as where early childhood programs could be a critical point for helping families link up with other services, and it needs to be a coordinating point as opposed to service provider. We talked about how the schools are sometimes asked to do everything. Early childhood programs also can't be expected to do everything. But they can be a point for linkage with other community services.

Ms. **Broun**. Would it make sense to have the local task force (which includes parents, the schools, school boards, Departments of Social Services, Head Start, and so on), to have greater representation by the parent community than as the bill is drafted now?

Ms. **Jenkins**. I would like to say that if you're going to put one parent on any task force with an awesome group that represents the professional agencies in any given community, that's asking a great deal. You are not going to be getting a parent that's representative perhaps of the students in the program. And that was one of your goals.

So I would think, for no other reason than moral support, two or three parents on a small committee—and, of course, we don't know what size committee you're talking about—would be necessary.

In California, our State is undergoing tremendous change in demographics. It is something that no other State in our country has faced before, because we have inmigration from other States, and we have migration, immigration from the entire Pacific Basin. It's just an awesome task to find ways to relate to all of the different cultures and get those parents to feel comfortable working within the mainstream education system.

Anything you can do to set up a format where we force people to look at that and deal with it, I think is going to be very helpful.

Ms. BROUN. Ms. Bentley, would you increase the participation of parents on a local advisory board?

Ms. BENTLEY. I agree that very often it is an intimidating thing for a single parent to be included as sort of a token, and so I think—I'm speaking personally now, I don't think our group has really looked into that aspect of the bill—but, yes, I think it would be advisable and good to have more than one parent, at least more than one.

Ms. WILLER. I would just say there are a number of ways for building that involvement. And I wouldn't limit it only to one seat on the advisory committee, but look for other strategies as well.

Ms. BROUN. I want to thank you all very much. We'll adjourn for a few minutes. Senator Kennedy is expected back momentarily and we'll pick up with the next panel at that time.

Thank you.

[Short recess.]

The CHAIRMAN. I again apologize to all witnesses. We had a meeting in there with some four and five-year olds, and earlier I had to make the presentation to the Armed Services Committee. And we're going to have our amendment up from the floor shortly.

So we'll apologize to the witnesses and thank them very much for their understanding. We'll hear from Gerald Tirozzi, who joins us from Connecticut, as Commissioner of the Department of Education, testifying on behalf of the Council of Chief State School Officers. We're very glad to have him here.

A special warm welcome to Eugenia Boggus, President of the National Head Start Association. It's one of the successful programs we hope to expand. We have been a long-time supporter of the Head Start program. I remember when it was drafted actually here in this very committee room many years ago.

So we'll ask you, Mr. Tirozzi, if you'll maybe speak briefly, and then I want to hear from Ms. Boggus. And then what I'm going to do is ask you each come back. I'm reluctant to do it, but I just necessarily have to do it. Amanda will take the remaining testimony.

I saw you here, Mr. Tirozzi, very early this morning. So I know you've sat through all of the testimony this morning. I know Chris Dodd and Senator Weicker would both want me to extend their welcome. They're both extremely active members of this committee, and both have been enormously supportive of education and early childhood, whether it's been on the ABC Program or Parental Leave.

I understand Senator Dodd is going to do his best to be here at 10:15.

So would you like to begin.

STATEMENT OF HON. GERALD N. TIROZZI, COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION, STATE OF CONNECTICUT, HARTFORD, CT, COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS

Mr. TIROZZI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First, the Chiefs would like very much to commend you for your initiative with the Smart Start program. We definitely believe it is essential, and we applaud your leadership in this particular area.

I'm going to divert somewhat from my presentation and try to address what I think is the pivotal issue as you expressed earlier this morning. And that is how the Federal funds under Smart Start can leverage local and State funds for preschool programs, not only for the immediate present but also far into the future.

I think the answer to that question is in large part answered by the structure of governance at the State and local levels. And I think that's something we're going to have to be very concerned with. I'll be specific on that point.

Also I want to make it clear that we see the Smart Start initiative as part of a major Federal initiative to expand early childhood education and child care as included in the proposed ABC and other bills. And we really applaud that effort.

Also I want to make it clear we see this as a major equity issue. In this country, we must ensure that all children have the right to high quality preschool experience. Equity does not begin in kindergarten. It begins really at birth. It's a major issue.

But essentially, and I could extol on the virtues of the bill and all of the wonderful things you've heard from other people, we support all of the above. I'm trying to move my comments forward.

We do have concerns that deal with the proposed new organization and administrative arrangements. And while, in fact, the provisions as they are presently stated, allow for flexibility, we do not feel that they're adequate to assure the quality of control and the coordination needed.

Essentially, there are two main themes that I read in the bill. One, you want to ensure this articulation between the preschool effort and school, the kindergarten and primary units. You also want to be certain somehow the program can be extended with State and local fiscal support. And I think that's absolutely critical.

Also, this bill, and I state this directly from your definition section, it speaks of early childhood development as education. And this is an education bill, and that to me is clear. As a matter of fact, I applaud the efforts to place this responsibility with the Secretary of Education.

And as you look to promoting this program, we would strongly recommend that if, in fact, it is an education bill, and we believe it is, and we commend that, then it should reside with the education agencies fully understanding that other providers could still provide services and fully respecting the right an advisory council.

But someone is going to have to make final administrative decisions. I think that is critical.

Also, Senator, a point I would make, and you are going to hear a major Head Start presentation, and the Council supports Head Start, and I firmly support Head Start, I think it's been a wonderful program in this country. But I do have two concerns with Head Start.

One, it has not always guaranteed an articulation between the preschool and the regular school component that I think is so necessary. And as good as Head Start has been, if you look across the country, it has never really been successful in causing for major local or State fiscal support to allow the program to expand.

And what we would suggest is that if it resides with the state and local education agencies, you have built in the potential for adding the dollars that are going to be necessary to continue a program of this type. And I think that really is one of the critical issues.

With the number of the providers that are out there, if in fact the expectation is they're going to leverage funds, I think one has to realistically ask where are they going to get the funds if, after the fact, they turn to Boards of Education and their State agencies. I think that is going to be very difficult. And we do not have a history in this country of being very successful in that effort.

So I guess the position of the Chiefs very clearly is, it is an education bill, it should reside in education agencies, and at the same time, it should respect everything you want to do in the bill with advice and consultation, a multitude of providers working with other agencies. That is not at issue at all.

The bottom line we think is the issue of governance, and we really don't think we need to create new layers of Government and/or administration. Ultimately, those only serve to bog down efforts.

So you have our support, you have our commitment to come become you and work with members of our staff to address these issues and concerns. We are 100 percent behind the bill. We just offer our recommendation in the hope that we can improve the mechanism to ensure that not only is the bill enacted but ultimately over time the very things you want to see will take place.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Tirozzi follows:]

President
VERNE A. DUNCAN
Oregon Superintendent
of Schools

President Elect
TED SANDERS
Illinois Superintendent
of Education

Vice President
DAVID W. HORNBECK
Maryland State Superintendent
of Schools

Directors

JERRY L. EVANS
Idaho Superintendent
of Public Instruction

HERBERT J. GROVER
Wisconsin Superintendent
of Public Instruction

WILLIAM B. KEENE
Delaware Superintendent
of Public Instruction

RUTH E. RANDALL
Minnesota Commissioner
of Education

LYNN O. SIMONS
Wyoming State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

CHARLIE G. WILLIAMS
South Carolina Superintendent
of Education

Executive Director
GORDON M. AMBACH

STATEMENT BY THE
COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS
BEFORE THE
SENATE LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE

The Council Statement is Presented By
Gerald N. Tirozzi
Commissioner of Education
State of Connecticut
June 10, 1988

Education
. . . a sound
investment in
AMERICA

COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS
379 Hall of the States, 400 North Capitol Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001 • 202/393-8161

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I appreciate the opportunity to testify before you today on behalf of the nation's state and territorial commissioners and superintendents of education on S. 2270, Smart Start: The Community Collaborative for Early Childhood Development Act of 1988. We applaud you for introducing Smart Start and pledge our vigorous support to help pass this legislation.

Smart Start should be considered as a part of a major Federal initiative to expand both early childhood education and child care as included in the proposed ABC and other bills. S. 2270 assumes a close fit between education and childcare to provide day-long and year-long service. Smart Start is clearly a supplement to the current federal provisions of Head Start. Insuring that all children have access to quality pre-school programs is a national equity issue. Equity does not begin with compulsory school years; it begins at birth.

Expanded federal support for pre-kindergarten programs is essential. The value of investment in this level of education has been persuasively presented to your Committee in earlier testimony. We do not need to take time in commenting on the impressive returns on funding pre-kindergarten.

S. 2270 recognizes the need for and value of increased investment in early childhood education. The funding and matching mechanism assures a federal-state partnership in the endeavor. As Connecticut's Commissioner of Education, I can attest to the need for a federal incentive to states to expand early childhood education. Enactment and funding of a federal Smart Start initiative would be a great incentive to leverage state and local funds for this purpose.

Smart Start is educationally and developmentally sound. We support the emphasis on use of age appropriate child development curricula; adult-to-child ratios and group size limitations which experience has shown are most effective; program supervision by early childhood education specialists; and, adequate training for all personnel. These provisions are key to successful pre-kindergarten programs.

We support the dual objectives of the bill -- to expand early childhood programs and to provide more effective connections among education programs and other services for young children and their families. These objectives are essential to providing a "smart start" for children most at risk of school failure. The bill successfully targets the funds to those children most in need of this start.

We commend the focus of your legislation on all-day child development opportunities for children the year before traditional schooling begins in their state. This feature creates an important link between Smart Start pre-kindergarten programs and the regular school years. We support the provision that several types of organizations and institutions, both public and private, should be eligible to receive Smart Start funds for services to preschool children.

We share your commitment to legislation which meets your expectations of coordination between pre-kindergarten and the later schools years and assurance of cooperation and quality control among multiple providers. The current draft of S. 2270 proposes new organizational and administrative arrangements for pre-kindergarten services. These provisions would enable flexibility among the states and localities, but they are not adequate to assure the coordination and quality control needed. We recommend they be revised to assure more streamlined administration; more direct accountability for administration; and a guarantee that the new federal funds will be effectively connected with local and state resources now committed to or to be committed in the future to similar services. The objectives of coordination and of flexibility can be better achieved by revising provisions in the initial bill. We urge your consideration of the following:

Smart Start is an education bill. Although the term "early childhood development program" is used in the bill, the definition of early childhood development is education. It is designed to work in conjunction with increased opportunities for child care which would come through a bill such as ABC. But, Smart Start centers on education.

At the federal level, responsibility for Smart Start is placed with the Secretary of Education who, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, administers the program. We support that provision and recommend a parallel structure at the state level which places responsibility for this education program with the state education agency. Such an assignment would be in accordance with administration of major federal education programs, such as Chapter 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Education of All

Handicapped Act, and the new Even-Start Act, each of which serves children at the pre-kindergarten level. To assure coordination with other federal programs and with state programs, the Smart Start initiative should be administered through state education agencies with appropriate consultation with other state agencies.

Smart Start is designed to provide for long-term, continuous and effective education beginning at an early age. The program has a state and local match requirement with a tapering off of federal funds for each project. The expectation is that the states and localities will establish the financial and administrative structure necessary to solidly connect Smart Start initiatives with state and local school system programs and expand the reach of Smart Start funds. To accomplish this, the administrative structure at the State level must incorporate this new education initiative with the State governance structure for education.

Smart Start would create entities called "State Advisory Task Forces." These would be, in fact, much more than advisory task forces; they would be administrative agencies. The States are at a point where they are striving to streamline government operations and to assign clear line responsibility for functions. To assure the efficiency and success of a new federal initiative, we should not create additional operative machinery at state or local levels, but rather use existing agencies for operations and require appropriate consultation with other agencies. The need for consultation at the state level could be met through an advisory council including representatives of the governor, the state legislature, significant other state agencies, local providers, education authorities, parents, teachers, administrators, and board members.

Administrative arrangements for Smart Start at the local level should also be streamlined to assure close links with the educational structure. The bill provides flexibility in the use of public or private providers for the service. We support such flexibility. However, assurances of coordination and quality control must also be provided. Among such assurances are these: cooperation among multiple providers; connection of Smart Start with other pre-kindergarten programs; articulation of Smart Start programs with kindergarten; and, efficiency of administration. To attain these objectives Smart Start should be governed by local school districts or entities which are created from local school district authority or the authority of a consortium of local school districts.

In the event a local school district might choose not to make application for funds under this program, other eligible providers serving the same population would be authorized to make application. If there would be any limitations with respect to a local agency's authority to fund programs in private, nonprofit organizations, then arrangements for bypass such as those which have been created under Chapter 1 of ESEA could be used.

S. 2270 anticipates a gradual assumption, at the local as well as the state level, of the cost of this service. If that is to happen, the service must be linked closely from the beginning of the program with those who have responsibility for governance and operation of education. Consultative or advisory bodies should be required at the local level consistent with the provisions at the State level.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, the Council of Chief State School Officers applauds strongly this federal initiative to expand and support educational opportunities for children during their most formative years. We believe so strongly in this initiative and are so anxious to help you make this Federal program work effectively that we offer our recommendations for streamlined governance and administration.

We will be pleased to join you, your colleagues, and members of the Committee staff in continuing discussions on S. 2270 to accomplish the objectives of building a program that will genuinely stimulate long lasting state and local commitment and in a federal partnership to serve our youngest children and their families. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.
Ms. Boggus.

STATEMENT OF EUGENIA BOGGUS, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL HEAD START ASSOCIATION, PITTSBURGH, PA

Ms. BOGGUS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be here to testify to you that have supported the Head Start program throughout the years.

As you know, Head Start is a comprehensive program for low-income children. And Head Start children receive medical, nutrition and dental services as well as planned classroom activities which increase their social and developmental skills.

Children who have handicaps are served in the same classroom as other Head Start children, but are given extra attention and services as needed.

Some Head Start programs use community resources as the Foster Grandparent program to provide large amounts of individual attention to special children.

We hope this committee will work to strengthen and expand Head Start. Head Start is a proven program that Congress has supported for over two decades. There was a long-term investment in Head Start and there is confidence in Head Start. Increases in funding for this program could be used in many ways. But there are three that are particularly important.

First, funding is needed to strengthen the teacher training program in Head Start. Many years ago, we used past parents and other untrained workers in the Head Start program, but we found out more could be accomplished with children and parents if the teachers had more skills. The teacher training program, including the CDA program, however, were started. However, the Head Start training budget has not been increased for eight years, which means that, with inflation, there has been a decrease in training money.

Second, money is needed to increase salaries. Once Head Start teachers are trained and have experience, often they are hired away by other programs causing too frequent staff turnovers which hurts the children served by Head Start. With frequent staff changeovers, sometimes the children wonder if something is really wrong when the teacher just needed a job to pay enough support to help her own family above the poverty level.

Third, money is needed to enhance the social services component through better training of social workers as the need for comprehensive programs for low-income children is increasing. More mothers are working, not because they want to, but because they must. Single mothers, of course, have always had to work, but now mothers in two-parent homes are having to work too, and even some of these families are below the poverty level. These families need strong support from social services to help them deal with the problems of working and raising children, and to help them deal with the alcohol and drug problems that now are part of some of their lives.

In addition to these pressing needs, an additional area of concern is extended day and summer programs. Most Head Start programs are only part-day programs and provide no services to children during the summer. Working Head Start mothers must find other places to care for their child during the rest of the day and the summer. Funding is needed to increase the number of children who can be served, and the hours and number of months children, particularly children of working mothers or mothers in training programs, can be served. These mothers do not want to take their children out of Head Start and put them in other programs for the entire day.

Today, I am expressing concern about child care for children of all ages, infants through early teen years. Child care seems to be a universal need.

Although this Administration provided Head Start with a modest increase, they reduced other services, such as Regional Office support and monitoring. We are looking to this committee to provide us with the expansion and strength we need. The success of Head Start has been due to its comprehensiveness, its diversified delivery system, local control, and most of all, parent involvement.

Head Start works for children and for parents. It is a comprehensive program. It is a proven program. It deserves full and expanded support. For that reason, we are concerned about the possible establishment of two Federal funding streams. Our priority is to expand and support Head Start, a proven system that truly works to help low-income children and families.

Owen Butler, Chairman of the Council for Economic Development, in his testimony before this committee, has defined the problem. "It makes little sense to have two programs." His solution of taking money from Head Start and giving it to Smart Start is exactly what we fear. Over the long run, if money needed to expand Head Start is given to Smart Start, poor families will be the ones who will suffer.

I have diverted a lot from my testimony because I know you're pressed for time.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Boggus follows:]

NATIONAL HEAD START ASSOCIATION

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE
888 Whiteside Road
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
412-665-3900

NATIONAL OFFICE
1029 31st Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007
202-337-6650

Board of Directors

President
Eugenia Boggus

Vice President
Richard Ybarra

Secretary
Charla C. Shipley

Assistant Secretary
[illegible]

Treasurer
Dr. Edward Wade

Assistant Treasurer
[illegible]

Dr. Howard Curry
Madine Cummings
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
Sarah Greene
[illegible]
Sister Barbara McMillan
Minnie Murphy
Ann O'B[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
Roberta S[illegible]
Landrum Shields
Willie Simmons
Larry Stroshton
Joyce Stover
Phyllis Jones

Executive Director
Sarah Greene

Testimony of Eugenia Boggus

President of the National Head Start Association

before the

Senate Committee on Labor and Human Relations

June 10, 1988

Mr. Chairman, and other distinguished members, I am pleased to be here and to testify before a committee that has supported Head Start throughout the years. I am Eugenia Boggus, President of the National Head Start Association and a past parent who has received services through Head Start.

As you know, Head Start is a comprehensive program for low-income children. Head Start children receive medical, nutrition and dental services as well as planned classroom programs which increase their social and developmental skills. Children who have handicaps are served in the same classrooms as the other Head Start children but are given extra attention and services as needed. Some Head Start programs use such community resources as the Foster Grandparent program to provide large amounts of individual attention to special children.

Research done through the Perry Preschool Project has shown that children attending comprehensive day care programs, such as Head Start, tend to more often complete High School, and are less likely to be involved in teenage pregnancy, crime, and welfare dependency. In dollars and cents, the study found an investment of $4,000 per child produced benefits of $28,933 in reduced crime, welfare, special education and other costs.

Equally important, Head Start provides training to meet Head Start parents' needs in the areas of health, nutrition, education and parenting. Head Start parents have the opportunity to learn preventive health, emergency first aid and safety measures. Parents are introduced to health care resources in the community as they go to appointments with their child. They are visited by their child's teacher and are given suggestions for helping the child learn at home. They also receive emotional support to help them develop skills in areas such as positive self-concept, coping with problems, and improved interpersonal relationships. As the child reaches school age, parents are encouraged to reach out to the public schools, to continue to attend parent conferences and to ask for teacher conferences if their child is having problems in school. Parents of special children are told what to expect in the schools, and how to help their child get appropriate services.

Parents who feel better about themselves, who have learned more appropriate ways to cope with their environment, who have learned how to deal with a sick child and medical emergencies, who have learned what is best to feed their child, who have learned that teachers can be helpful rather than someone to be afraid of, who have learned where to go for help, who have learned how to help their child learn--such parents will be more able to help their child over the long term than parents who have not learned these skills.

Unfortunately, not nearly all of the children who are eligible for Head Start and who could benefit from the program can attend Head Start. Nationwide, in 1980, Head Start served 20% of those eligible for the program. Today it serves only 16% of those eligible.

This committee must work to expand and strengthen Head Start. Head Start is a proven program that Congress has supported for over two decades. There is a long-term investment in Head Start. There is confidence in Head Start.

Increases in funding for this program could be used in many ways, but three seem particularly important. First, funding is needed to strengthen the teacher training program in Head Start. Many years ago the Head Start classrooms were staffed mainly by past parents and other untrained workers. Then we saw that more could be accomplished with the children and parents if the teachers had more skills. Teacher training programs, including the CDA program, were started. However, the Head Start training budget has not been increased for eight years, which means that, with inflation, there has actually been a decrease in training money.

Second, money is needed to increase salaries. Once Head Start teachers are trained and have some experience, often they are hired away by other programs, causing too frequent staff turn-over which hurts the children served by Head Start. Frequent staff changes make children wonder if they did something wrong, when really the teacher just needed a job that paid enough to help get her own family above the poverty level.

Third, money is needed to enhance the social services component through better training of social workers as the need for comprehensive programs for low-income children is increasing. More mothers are working--not because they want to, but because they must. Single mothers, of course, have always had to work, but now mothers in two-parent homes are having to work, too, and even some of those families are below the poverty level. These families need strong support from social services to help them deal with the problems of working and raising children, and to help them deal with the alcohol and drug problems that now are part of some of their lives.

In addition to these pressing needs, an additional area of concern is extended day and summer programs. Most Head Start programs are only part-day programs and provide no services to children during the summer. Working Head Start mothers must find other places to care for their child during the rest of the day and the summer. Funding is needed to increase the number of children who can be served, and the hours and number of months children, particularly children of working mothers or mothers in training programs, can be served. These mothers do not want to take their children out of Head Start and put them in other programs for the entire day. They see that Head Start is a comprehensive program which helps their children make gains that other day care programs do not. And sometimes they see that there is simply nowhere else for the child to go.

Today, I am expressing concern about child care for children of ALL ages, infants through early teenage years. Child care seems to be a universal need. Over half of children ages five to eight are cared for by older brothers and sisters. Sometimes even infants are left with older children--because there is simply nowhere else to leave them that the parent can afford. I would like to see Congress pass the ABC bill to provide these services to families. In the ABC Bill, there is a set-aside to provide afternoon care for children of working parents, and we encourage the committee to do likewise in the reauthorization of Head Start.

Although this administration provided Head Start with modest increases, they reduced other services such as Regional Office support and monitoring. We are looking to this committee to provide us with the expansion and strength we need. The success of Head Start has been due to its comprehensiveness, diversified delivery system, local control, and--most of all--parent involvement.

In closing, I would like to tell you a little bit about myself, since I am one of many examples of how well the Head Start program works for children and families. I married at 16 and started having children, seven in all. I had four children before I heard about Head Start. When my fifth child was four, I tried to get him into Head Start, but there were no slots. Even though he was blind, his name went on a long waiting list, and he never got into the program. There were no other complete, affordable, preschool programs available. I could not work because I had no place to leave my children, especially my son. I did not have enough income to pay for even minimal child care, much less the level of care my blind son needed. I was raising my children by myself, needed help, and had nowhere to turn. I cannot help but feel that if he had gotten into Head Start, my son's schooling and his life would have been different.

My last two children did get into Head Start. There was a lot of difference between them and my older children. My first children went to school with no confidence, but the children who went to Head Start began school with confidence and expected to do well. I am proud to say, my youngest daughter is an all-"A" Honor Roll student. Head Start provided sound, comprehensive, services, which gave her a good beginning. It gave her feelings of success, increased her self-esteem, and made her think she could succeed in competitive situations. She still faces challenges with confidence.

When my children were in Head Start, I met some of the most dedicated and talented people you could want to meet. Many were former Head Start parents who had gone on to school. Some were young, energetic college graduates, and others, mature teachers. To them Head Start was more than a job; in many ways, it was more like a calling.

It took a long time for me to be able to think and talk about my personal life. I still might not be able to if it had not been for my last son's Head Start teacher. She became my friend. All of the parents with children in her class were her special friends too, but I still knew she was my friend. After awhile, I was able to admit to my problems and begin to deal with them.

My relationship with this teacher led me to get involved with the Head Start Parent Committee. Serving on the Parent Committee helped give me the confidence I so badly needed and I became less shy. I found that I had abilities I did not even know I had.

Eventually, I went on to get an AA Degree in Child Development. It takes a special staff to encourage and support a single mother with with seven children, two under age five, to get a college degree when she has been out of high school more than ten years.

Head Start works for children and for parents. It is a comprehensive program. It is a proven program. It deserves full and expanded support. For that reason, we are concerned about the possible establishment of two Federal funding streams. Our priority is to expand and support Head Start, a proven system that truly works to help low-income children and families.

Owen Butler, chairman of the Council for Economic Development, in his testimony before this committee, has defined the problem ". . .it makes little sense to have two programs." His solution of taking the money from Head Start and giving it to Smart Start is exactly what we fear. Over the long run, if money needed to expand Head Start is given to expand Smart Start, poor families will be the ones who will suffer.

The CHAIRMAN. I know. We hope that you will have a chance to return.

We've met with a lot of the Head Start Directors up in my own State. And I think it's important that we try and understand each other's position.

Of course, I've been a long-time supporter of Head Start, and cosponsored ABC, as well as the Parental Leave bill.

But with the focus on the educational component, what we're basically talking about is not a new program, but a new funding stream to build on existing programs that are providing the range of services that Head Start provides in various communities. But it's the educational component that we're emphasizing. And I thought that was well described earlier in the course of the hearings.

You already have the educational component in the Head Start program, but we're trying to enhance it so that the teachers get additional resources. And they are made available in this legislation.

We build on those types of programs which have been effective for preschool children. We're not trying to reinvent the wheel. What we're trying to do is take the various overwhelmingly convincing evidence that points out the early educational component, as described by those earlier in the hearing today, and others, added to the kind of programs which are there in Head Start, can be useful.

Of course, ABC is much more extensive, from toddlers to 15. We're talking about, you know, the four and five-year olds in these kinds of programs.

But we're trying to target something that has some distinction in terms of the educational component. We don't want this to be drawing down the resources, particularly after the last seven years, when we've seen groups that have been hard-pressed because of program cutbacks. And it's all really coming out of basically the same families, because when you cut back on nutrition, you can see the cutbacks in Head Start, they're cutting back on fuel assistance programs, you cut back on low-income housing, it's all reaching the same family for the most part.

So as someone who, over a long period of time, has been strongly committed to both those programs and those families, I want to give you the assurance that this is in no way trying to take away from Head Start, but rather to add and to build and, by building, to create additional kinds of opportunities and resources for Head Start and all of these programs.

That call was for me over on the floor now. Senator Dodd will be here. Maybe Amanda could provide some questions to Senator Dodd, and then you might just summarize again for Senator Dodd, if we can proceed that way.

Again I apologize, but that's the reality that we are faced with.

Senator DODD [presiding]. The meeting will come to order.

Good morning, Gerry.

Mr. TIROZZI. Good morning, Senator.

Senator DODD. It's a pleasure to see my Commissioner from Connecticut here in this sort of a tag team approach this morning with all the votes going on and the matters on the floor of the Senate.

So I am sure that Senator Kennedy has already apologized for having to run around as much as we do. But he's deeply involved in a matter on the floor right now in the Senate.

Why don't you just complete and continue where you were, and we'll have some questions for you in a minute.

We've got a little noise going on here. It's new members of the Senate that are coming in.

Mr. **Tirozzi**. Good morning, Senator.

Essentially I have completed my testimony. I just would like to make two or three points to you.

One, of course, the Council of Chief State School Officers and yours truly are very supportive of this legislation. We also see the definite linkage with the bill that you are sponsoring, the ABC bill. We take a strong position that Smart Start is an educational program, and that is referenced very specifically in the bill.

And, in particular, while, you know, I could offer all of the accolades—I think you will hear those from a number of others—we simply want to raise what we think is critical and important and pivotal that is the question of governance and how we can ensure the articulation between Smart Start and early childhood education in the school; and, in particular, how we can assure that the goal of the bill to cause for a transfer of funding over time from the Federal Government with a greater burden on State and local can take place. And it is our position that it only can truly take place if you link it directly to the existing educational agencies, State Departments of Education, local boards of education.

Otherwise, and as I said to my esteemed colleague on my left, Head Start with all of its successes over the past 20 years has really had very little success in generating major State and local dollars to further promote that program.

So we'd be happy to answer questions you may have on the governance issue or any other issue.

Senator **Dodd**. Anything from you, Ms. Boggus, at all, anything else?

Ms. **Boggus**. No. I have completed my testimony.

But we feel that Head Start is a good program. We feel like it's proven itself over the years. We feel there is no need to have two federally-funded programs and that we hope this committee would expand and strengthen Head Start. We would like to see Head Start get stronger and stronger. We feel that Head Start can do what the Smart Start bill is asking it to do.

Senator **Dodd**. Thank you very much. And Head Start has been remarkably successful and enjoys tremendous deep and broad-based support, as I'm sure you're aware, here in Congress.

Despite the efforts of some years ago talking about abolishing the program, its success clearly spoke more loudly than its critics. So I agree in part with you.

Commissioner Tirozzi, Smart Start, as you know, is intended to build upon already existing programs to upgrade their services, extend their hours. Obviously, we don't want to duplicate programs if they already exist. That would be a waste of money.

As you know, some State have already begun, of course, early childhood programs which are administered through their State Social Departments.

If you require, as you just mentioned in your summation, that Smart Start be administered through State Education Departments in every State, we'd be duplicating, at least in some instances, if not many, duplicating existing programs, and that's not spending funds in the most cost-effective manner.

Mr. Tirozzi. I wouldn't personally necessarily see it as duplicating. There is a matching arrangement in the bill for which the States and the locals would be responsible. Also, even in most of those States where they have begun, they are not necessarily touching the most of the population of youngsters who are eligible.

And I don't personally think that is a problem. I think that is something that could be worked through.

On the other hand, you could make another argument that since States have already begun, why create another agency to deliver educational services? It seems to me, that would be a replication of effort.

One of my issues, Senator, it's very difficult to cause local Boards of Education and Superintendents to accept the responsibility for high quality preschool education unless, from the very beginning, they somehow have ownership of the program, understand the program, and understand that, you know, education begins before the kindergarten year.

And if, in fact, other providers are going to be responsible for the funding, the governance, et cetera, when the time comes to seek the transfer of funds, it's not going to happen. I mean history tells us it doesn't happen. I know in our State it doesn't happen.

Head Start is a wonderful program. To the best of my knowledge, most of our districts are not putting in very much money. I know the State is not putting in money. And that is an issue of concern we have as to how this bill will be enacted and how we can ensure it lives a long life.

Senator Dodd. Let me be the devil's advocate a bit.

Obviously, as a Commissioner of Education, no one would be terribly surprised by a Commissioner of Education's statements in that regard, but obviously we don't want to get into a political contest between Social Service Departments and Departments of Education in these areas.

Wouldn't it make more sense in some way to have some kind of an interagency group where you're dealing, because there will be non-school based programs here that would address some of these areas. And rather than get into that competitive environment between two well-meaning agencies in the State, to have sort of an interagency force, task force, where they'll be represented equally in this regard.

Does that make any sense? Or should it be, as you've suggested, that the Education Departments be the lead agency?

Mr. Tirozzi. Well, I think essentially I don't have any problems working with other agencies in State Government, but somewhere along the line, the ultimate responsibility has to reside with one of those agencies.

And with certain bills that are being discussed in Congress, as an Education Commissioner, I might have problems if they said they should reside with education, because I would see those more as social services.

But when we clearly state in the bill that it is an education program, if in fact you have Commissioners of Education and State Boards of Education and local boards and superintendents, I think you should automatically seek the linkage with education.

So I'm not standing before you saying this is a social service, so we don't believe someone else should have it. We'll work cooperatively with social service providers. I'm before you saying with all the responsibilities we have, and maybe because I believe so strongly in early childhood education, I welcome the opportunity to have that responsibility.

But I want to make it clear. Even if we had the responsibility, we would want very much to ensure that multiple providers had every opportunity to run the programs. The issue is really governance, and I think that could be structured and I think that could happen.

Senator Dodd. Well, you must be aware, I'm sure you are, of the fact that some school districts, some school administrators have already indicated that they really don't welcome this program. They've already got significant problems with space, and already overburdened, as they would tell you, and I think with a lot of justification, on performing so many other functions in addition to the primary function of education, that they really don't want to get involved in all of this.

How widespread is that, do you believe?

Mr. Tirozzi. Well, I think in fairness it is an issue. It's hard to give you an exact percentage.

I would like to think it is improving in terms of school districts understanding their responsibility for preschool education. But I think in our full testimony we begin to attempt to address that type of a question.

For example, if the State Department had the responsibility, I think our first responsibility would be to work with local school boards and superintendents. And we anticipate some will not want to run the program. And I think that's fine. I think then the State Department should seek out groups and organizations which could run the program. I don't think you penalize children because the local school board doesn't want the responsibility.

My own sense, as more and more pressure is being applied, and rightfully so, to high quality early childhood education, more and more school boards are going to come on and accept the responsibility.

And I think what this bill calls for, giving them the important startup money for a period of years, I think is something they're anxiously looking for.

What they don't want to do is go into their own budget. I think, you know, across this country, the pressure point for local school boards is K-12 education. For preschool and adult education, it is very difficult to find dollars. And I think if the Feds are coming in with this type of support, I think districts would be hard-pressed not to mount programs.

And then, once you have built success, it's much easier to convince Boards of Finance or municipal authorities to give you additional dollars.

Senator Dodd. Do you have any comments on these questions I have already asked, Ms. Boggus?

Ms. **Boggus**. Yes, I have some comments. As a mother of seven children, and being in the Head Start program, and I know Head Start works, it is difficult within the school system.

The one key element that makes anything successful in all that we are talking about, education—parents are the primary educators of their children. Anything that is successful, the parent has to be involved. That is a key element in everything.

The only concern I have really about the school district is that that key element is lost in the school setting.

Senator **Dodd**. Now, you are aware, of course, that under this proposal, it creates a funding stream, so that it wouldn't set up a separate system. In fact, the very things you have talked about, the funds could be used to enhance the purposes and the principles of the Head Start program, so they don't have to be in competition with one another.

Do you think the bill does not do that? Are you concerned that it does not do that?

Ms. **Boggus**. Yes, I am concerned about the extent to which the bill does that; what guarantee is there for that. That is a great concern.

Because I know that will be a key element in keeping the structure of that altogether.

Senator **Dodd**. Well, my understanding of it is, and others can correct me, although there is no one here to, so I will just tell you, it doesn't, so we will establish a legislative record I suppose.

It is there to complement and to support and enhance the very things that Head Start needs more support for. And that where that does not exist, then it can set up a structure.

But if the choice is to be between providing additional funding to support Head Start, or start something new, the dollar should go to support the existing Head Start program. That is my view of this legislation.

And others at some point here may want to correct me as to whether or not—express their disagreement with that conclusion. But that is what this legislation is designed and intended to do.

But I appreciate your concern, because it is one expressed by an awful lot of people. In fact, I had that initial concern. Because I think Head Start has been so successful that I did not in any way want to see it diminished at all, or eroded, through well intended legislative efforts that would distract dollars from a very worthwhile, proven, successful program.

I am convinced that this legislation, in fact, complements and strengthens the Head Start program as it is. In fact, I would not support it if it did not. I feel that strongly about it. That is my own view.

I cannot resist the question to both of your here, because one of the problems, and you have both been complimentary of the ABC bill, the childcare legislation which I have authored along with Senator Chafee, Senator Hollings, and others on the Senate side. One of the problem areas we are confronted with is Federal standards, minimum Federal standards.

There is a lot of criticism about that from some quarters that we have no right to be setting standards at all. I wonder if you might, Head Start of course has national performance standards. Smart Start has strong national performance standards.

We are proposing some. How important is this to you, for instance, Gerry, as a State commissioner, that there be minimum standards in Federal legislation like this?

Mr. TIROZZI. I personally do not have a problem with standards. You are driving the dollars; you have an expectation; you establish standards.

I think in fairness the standards of course should be reasonable, and I think there should always be some flexibility if for any reason standards have to be adjusted.

But I don't personally have a problem with clearly articulated, reasonable standards. I think they are necessary.

Ms. BOGGUS. I also think standards are necessary if they are reasonable and if they are a complement to what is in the bill that can be followed.

I just do not have a problem with standards.

Senator DODD. We have some that are included in the legislation now that deal with the—this is childcare—dealing with group size, staff child support ratios, provider training, and so forth.

Do you think those sound onerous or overreaching in your own views?

Mr. TIROZZI. I think they are in the realm of responsibility. No, I don't. You would have to look at the reasonableness of the standard itself.

But I think those particular areas are reasonable ones to express.

Senator DODD. Very good.

Well, you are concerned about ABC competing with Head Start?

Ms. BOGGUS. No, we support ABC. No, we are not concerned about ABC competing with Head Start. We assume an ABC bill where there would be a set-aside to provide afternoon care for children of working parents.

And we encourage the committee to do likewise in the reauthorization of Head Start.

Senator DODD. Well, I am glad to hear that. I have used the statistics that with Head Start, and you correct me if I am wrong, that we are reaching only one-half of the eligible population.

I heard someone use a statistic like one-fifth the other day. I do not know which one is correct. Am I off on the one half? I see heads bobbing in all different directions.

It is lower than a half, closer to maybe a fifth of the eligible population?

And of course on Head Start you are dealing with a few hours in a day, whereas with the ABC bill, we are talking about programs that literally could cover a 24-hour period, based on the needs of the community and the individuals who may work a second or third shift or the like.

Ms. BOGGUS. We are also talking about reauthorization of Head Start full day, for working mothers.

Mr. TIROZZI. Senator, just on ABC, we have felt from the very beginning that it is a real complement, not only to Head Start, but to the Smart Start bill. They really go hand in hand. We do not see it as a bifurcated effort. They complement each other.

Senator Dodd, [redacted], you have both been very generous of your time to come down and comment on this legislation. I know I speak on behalf of Senator Kennedy and others in expressing their gratitude to you.

So we thank you for being here.

There may be some additional questions that other Members may have, and so we will leave the record open for those questions and your responses, and if you have any additional thoughts, certainly feel free to submit them in writing to us as well.

We welcome your continuing participation in this discussion and debate as we move forward with the legislation. So we thank you for coming.

I will ask our next two witnesses, Dr. Donald Pierson. Dr. Pierson is a professor of education and director of field services and studies at the University of Lowell in Massachusetts. He is a former director of the Brookline early education project, and he will be sharing the very impressive results of that study with us today.

Dr. Larry Schweinhart joins us today on behalf of the High Scope Educational Research Foundation. Impressive research done by High Scope has convinced countless policymakers, including this committee, I would add, that early childhood education is an investment worth making.

Dr. Schweinhart and his colleague, Dr. David Weikart, have been a great help to us with their Smart Start legislation. We are honored that they could join us here today.

Now, I am going to tell you that in addition to having this distinguished panel here, you are going to have an audience with us as well. And this is what you have been hearing in the back. These are star witnesses today.

Our star witnesses are a group of 4-year-olds from the Head Start center in Fairfax County, and we would invite them to come on in and sit right in front here in the committee. Come on in everybody, right up front here.

Mrs. Cheney, we welcome you here this morning with your distinguished visitors. We welcome all of you here to the United States Senate this morning. And if you can be nice and quiet and patient and listen to these distinguished witnesses we have, we are going to talk about childcare, and we will get underway.

So we will begin with you, Dr. Pierson.

STATEMENT OF DONALD PIERSON, PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION AND DIRECTOR OF FIELD SERVICES AND STUDIES, UNIVERSITY OF LOWELL, LOWELL, MA; FORMER DIRECTOR, BROOKLINE EARLY EDUCATION PROJECT

Dr. Pierson. I am speaking from the perspective of the Brookline Early Education Project, which was funded by two private foundations, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, to determine the benefits of a comprehensive approach to early childhood education.

The project was conducted over an 11-year span, in which we followed 285 participating families from the child's birth through to second grade.

Four of the project's distinctive features are relevant to this bill. These include: One, a cross-section of families, low income as well as affluent. It was open to any resident of the town of Brookline, as well as the adjacent city of Boston.

Two, it was a comprehensive program of parent education, diagnostic monitoring, and pre-kindergarten services.

Three, the project was school-based, operating from the Brookline elementary schools.

And four, it had a cost-effectiveness research design in which parents were assigned at random to one of three cost levels for frequency of parent education programs.

Programs for the children were consistent for all families.

The highlights of the results at second grade were: One, with regard to classroom learning behaviors, independent observers followed children during the spring of the second grade year, and documented a reduction in the rate of learning difficulties by about one-half. Twenty-eight percent of children in our comparison group experienced learning difficulties by the independent observers 'criteria, and that was reduced to 14 percent in the participating group.

Secondly, with regard to reading level, approximately 32 percent of the children in the baseline comparison group had difficulty comprehending a grade-level basal reader in the spring of second grade; that was reduced to 19 percent.

Finally, regarding parent involvement which has been documented as so important to children's success in school, the comparison group parents initiated approximately 40 percent fewer contacts with the children's teacher than did parents of the participants.

When the data were analyzed with respect to family background and intensity of parent education, findings with important policy implications were revealed. That is, children whose parents were highly educated functioned relatively well without intensive outreach, yet benefits were evident for increments in service.

For instance, in the comparison group, for children whose parents were college graduates, only 20 percent experienced reading difficulty at second grade. But with the three successive levels of increase in parent outreach, the percentage of children with difficulty was reduced to 13, 10 and 3 percent.

In contrast, for children whose parents were not highly educated, were not college graduates, the outreach component was essential. Outreach included home visits, telephone calls, social work contacts. With these children, approximately 50 percent of the children in the comparison group experienced reading difficulties in the spring of the second grade year.

In our participant group with minimal outreach, where only drop-in services were available, we were not able to reduce that figure at all. In fact, 52 percent of those children experienced difficulties.

However, with successive increments of outreach, those figures were reduced to 32 percent in the moderate group, and for families that received home visits and meetings an average of once a month, that figure was reduced to only 29 percent of the children with reading difficulties.

In summary, results from the Brookline Early Education Project reinforce and clarify evidence previously available that carefully planned, high quality early childhood education can make a difference for all children.

While the town of Brookline, and the States of Minnesota, Missouri, and others, have adopted many of the components of the Brookline Early Education Project, it is clear that Federal initiative and support is necessary to enable significant numbers of children to obtain the benefits of early education.

The crisis in public education, and the unfulfilled human potential that are so often documented in this country can be addressed by programs for children at the earlier stages if this landmark legislation is enacted, and I am pleased to endorse it.

Senator DODD. Thank you very much, Doctor. I appreciate that. I had all these questions for you, and you have answered them in your statement. So we appreciate it very much.

Dr. Schweinhart, we welcome you as well. I know you have prepared remarks, and I will just tell you, that will be automatically included in the record. Why do you not just summarize those remarks for us?

STATEMENT OF LAWRENCE SCHWEINHART, DIRECTOR, VOICES FOR CHILDREN PROJECT, HIGH/SCOPE EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH FOUNDATION, YPSILANTI, MI

Dr. SCHWEINHART. I am very pleased to be here today. I have been working on the long term followup of the Perry Preschool program, for 13 years. For about the last nine years, I have been talking to various policymakers about it. And I am very pleased to be able to do that here today.

I represent the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, which is best known for that research and also for the High/Scope curriculum, an approach to early childhood education that is developmentally appropriate and focuses on active learning, problem solving, and all the kinds of things that I would like this testimony to do right now that it cannot possibly do because of its format.

There was testimony earlier today by Evelyn Moore, who was one of the teachers in the Perry Preschool program, who said that the key thing is not to have kids just sitting at desks and listening to teachers, but in fact to have them up and moving around and experiencing things in the classroom.

The Perry Preschool study and other studies like it show that good programs for young children first of all help them to be better prepared intellectually and socially for the rest of their lives. Their intellectual performance can become better. Their social behavior can become better. Also, they can develop a sense of self-reliance that can carry them through the school years in a very profitable way, and indeed, through the rest of their lives.

These kinds of things really can help to guard against school failure. And the school failure that we face because of the large amount of poverty in our society today and related problems is something that we really need to contend with.

It is what makes this kind of thing a sort of a delayed crisis. We don't face imminent disaster, but we face a steadily growing problem, set of problems, simply because school failure can be linked to so many other problems.

The Perry Preschool program and research like it has also shown, finally, as has been testified to several times—by the way, one of the things about testifying these days is that people cite the Perry Preschool program so much that I can only reiterate what other speakers have said when I get to it—but in fact we found that by improving school success, one can improve adult success, socioeconomic success, and social responsibility in a variety of ways. We really are looking at a lasting effect on a variety of social problems.

The most cited part of the Perry Preschool study has probably been its economic cost-benefit analysis, and the idea of a return on investment. And in fact we found a substantial return on investment, using the most conservative methods that made sense to find returns on investment in a one-year and two-year program. Even a three-year or four-year program would still have a positive return on investment, simply because the returns are so great.

That research has been cited in particular by the Committee for Economic Development. And I have noticed lately, it was even cited by George Bush in a recent speech, and Jesse Jackson has been talking about it, and Michael Dukakis, so it looks like we are going in the right direction, one way or the other.

The key thing to know about the Perry Preschool study and other studies like it, and a group of those studies, called the Consortium for Longitudinal Studies, is that programs, to have those effects, must be high quality programs. I cannot stress that enough. Wherever they are run, whoever is running them, they have to be high quality programs.

The Smart Start legislation, the ABC bill, the Head Start performance standards, all of these kinds of things are focused on providing high quality programs.

Now, it is not necessary for Congress to implement quality all by itself. It is just one beginning phase of the process.

Senator DODD. But minimum standards are something you would support?

Dr. SCHWEINHART. Absolutely.

Senator DODD. I wish you would say that loud and clear. And if you have George Bush and others reading and citing your material, that would be helpful, because they are missing that point.

Dr. SCHWEINHART. That is right, that is right. And in fact, in a lot of the testimony on ABC, that whole aspect of things has been notoriously missing.

I would go so far as to say that it is not so much a crisis of childcare that we have in this country as it is a crisis in the lack of quality childcare.

And until we can have uniformly high quality childcare and early education programs across the country so that we can be confident that children can receive those services everywhere, then we are not making it, and we are making a reckless gamble with the lives of our children.

Senator DODD. Well, I would disagree. I think there is a crisis in childcare. There is a crisis in quality with existing childcare, but there is still a crisis in childcare.

Dr. **Schweinhart**. Well, sure. I mean, the point is that if children don't have access to the kinds of programs that can lead to successful development, then the country is not doing what it needs to do for its children.

The kinds of things that are necessary to a high quality program, first of all, I want to stress again, a child development curriculum is absolutely essential. It is what all the rest is about.

It is absolutely essential that children have the kinds of experiences that will enable them to grow physically and socially as well as intellectually. It would be a tremendous misspending of funds if we only focused on academic preparation and did not look at the broader picture as well.

In order to move forward in early childhood education and care today, it is important to look at the very large picture of this. The best calculation I can make is that today 7.1 million children across the country receive either early childhood care or education from somebody other than their parents. That is about half of all children under the age of five. And that is going on right now, regardless of what we do about it.

If you look at government expenditures, Head Start, the social services block grant, all the public school expenditures for pre-kindergarten, we are only reaching maybe 15 percent of children with those kinds of grant funds.

Now, the dependent care tax credit extends considerably farther than that. But I believe that the Federal role should be very much a leadership role.

And I think what we have got to look at is fundamental improvement in all the delivery systems that we have now, if we really want to provide uniformly high quality programs. I was really quite taken with the testimony on Head Start, and I just want to underscore that some of the pressing needs in Head Start are for training to be much more available, and also, for salaries to be higher.

The salaries for Head Start teachers average under $9,000 a year now across the country; that is a travesty. In private childcare generally, which is where most of those 7.1 million children are, the salaries are the same as in Heat Start; the training issues are even greater, because now in Head Start, two-thirds of the teachers have either a child development associate credential, or an early childhood degree. The training needs in childcare generally are much greater than that.

We need to look at community education, as well as simply training of staff. It is not enough, really, for Head Start to view itself as needing to meet only the training needs of its staff. It is the Federal effort. It ought to be looking at that much larger issue as well, and of course, ABC would do that directly as well.

The other thing I want to say is that the public schools also need to look at improvement. As we talk about public school provision of programs, it cannot be business as usual.

There has to be fundamental improvement in the way people think, a new vision of what early childhood education is about in most of the schools.

It is true that there are excellent programs. It is worth noting that both the Brookline project, and indeed, the Perry Preschool project, for most of its existence, were run in public schools.

But the reason people are so worried about public schools is because there is so much of the other kind of stuff going on, so much teacher-directed instruction, and so much academic pressure.

We cannot let such miseducation affect children like the ones we have here today.

Smart Start is dedicated to quality. It has the appropriate regulations. It is also building on state initiatives, just as ABC focuses at the State level as well. And that is a really valuable thing. Frankly, it would be another good development for Head Start if it started developing stronger State ties as well.

Smart Start would indeed complement ABC in the sense that it would be providing full daycare for four-year-olds which is one particular area of need, not perhaps the greatest, but a large area of need as well.

And mostly all of these bills would be focused on upgrading the indecent salaries that exist throughout the private childcare and Head Start professions today.

These salaries do not even permit people to get out of poverty, if that is all the income that they have. And we cannot hope to really develop a decent childcare system across the country until we have salaries that really hold staff; the turnover rate in childcare today is about 36 percent, which is double what it is in other occupations.

The simple conclusion is, congratulations, keep it up, get it passed. It is time for America to invest in children.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Schweinhart follows:]

SMART START IS AN INVESTMENT WORTH MAKING

Testimony for the
U.S. Senate
Committee on Labor and Human Resources
Washington, DC 20510
June 10, 1988
by
Lawrence J. Schweinhart
High/Scope Educational Research Foundation
600 North River Street
Ypsilanti, MI 48198

Senator Kennedy, Committee Members, and distinguished guests, I represent the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation--an independent, non-profit organization founded by David Weikart in 1970 in Ypsilanti, Michigan. Our mission is to develop applications of human-development knowledge to the care and education of young people and to help others make these applications. We are most widely known for the Perry Preschool study, which demonstrated the long-term effects of high-quality early childhood programs for children who live in poverty; and for the High/Scope Curriculum, an educational approach that emphasizes child-initiated-learning activities and is now used by thousands of teachers throughout the U.S. and around the world.

Outcomes of High-Quality Early Childhood Development Programs

In this rich country, 22 percent of our children under age 6 live in poverty, including 44 percent of all Black and Hispanic children.[1] These children are at risk of school failure and dropout, illiteracy, crime and delinquency, teen pregnancy, chronic unemployment, and adult dependency.[2]

Although there is no simple solution to this problem, research has identified high-quality early childhood programs, such as those proposed in the Smart Start bill, as a way to help improve these children's lives. Abundant evidence indicates that high-quality early childhood programs do improve the intellectual performance and social behavior of poor children so that they experience less failure in their early school years.[3] Ample evidence indicates that such programs will probably reduce the percentages of these children who are placed in special education or held back a grade, helping them to assume a more favorable position to achieve school success.[4] A few studies, including the Perry Preschool study, show that preschool participation, by improving poor children's school success, can lead them to greater adult success and social responsibility. Follow-up on young people in the Perry study at age 19 shows that preschool participation can increase the percentage of persons who are literate, employed, and enrolled in postsecondary education, whereas it can reduce the percentages who are school dropouts, labeled mentally retarded, on welfare, and arrested for delinquent offenses.[5]

The economic cost-benefit analysis of the Perry Preschool Program and its long-term effects reveals that such programs are an excellent investment for taxpayers, bringing a substantial return for every dollar invested--three dollars per dollar invested in a 16-month program at ages 3 and 4 and six dollars per dollar invested in an 8-month program at age 4. For each participant, in 1981 dollars discounted at 3 percent, the annual program cost is $4,000 to $5,000, which brings total benefits to taxpayers of about $28,000--from savings in costs of special education, crime, and welfare assistance, and higher tax revenues due to projected increases in lifetime earnings.[6] The Committee for Economic Development, an organization of 250 business executives and university presidents, in its 1987 book Children in Need, said, "Preschool programs that target the disadvantaged and stress developmental learning and social growth represent a superior educational investment for society."[7]

For children who are not poor or otherwise at risk of school failure, the little available evidence suggests that high-quality early childhood programs do help, but not nearly as much as they help poor children. Evidence from the Brookline Early Education Project in Massachusetts--which provided comprehensive services to children from infancy to kindergarten and served both middle-income and low-income families--shows that by the end of grade two, half as many participants had classroom behavior problems (14% vs. 28% of the control group) and fewer had reading difficulty (19% vs. 32%).[8]

Although most of the research on early childhood programs has been conducted with children living in poverty, it bears testimony to the importance of good early childhood experiences for all children, at home and in programs. Poverty is not a permanent characteristic of a person, but rather a set of experiences, just as a preschool program is a set of experiences. Thus, regardless of family income, custodial-care and excessively academic programs for young children do not help, and may even harm, their development.

Program Quality Is Essential to Return on Investment

We must be cautious in applying criteria of financial value to the lives of our children: Children's lives are literally priceless. But children have almost no direct voice in politics. These are times that require tough choices, and, in the absence of tough arguments, the choices will be claimed by strong political constituencies. If these choices are made on purely political grounds, children--most of all, children living in poverty--will lose, and with their loss we will all diminish our future. Economic analysis was designed to help make choices, especially tough ones; and economic arguments favor effective programs for children, simply because good programs can positively affect children for the rest of their lives.

In the public ledger book, the ink is usually readable only on the expenditures side; the benefits side is usually written in invisible ink. Hard-nosed accountants scrutinize the expenditures, but there are few hard-nosed researchers to scrutinize the long-term effects of expenditures. As a result, public policymakers have to take risks: They must balance the probabilities of return on investment against the certainties of current expenditures. The value of research that identifies long-term benefits is that it reduces the risks of investing in high-quality early childhood programs. Low-quality, underfunded programs are not an investment but a reckless gamble with our nation's most precious commodity--the lives and futures of our children.

A serious mistake is made by people who say that the Perry Preschool study and studies like it simply prove that Head Start or child care work. These studies do not prove that these programs work regardless of their quality. What they do show is that, when these programs are of high quality, they work very well indeed, contributing to children's lives even as they provide economic benefits to the community.

The Definition of Early Childhood Program Quality

Research on early childhood programs confirms what experience and common sense suggest: Program quality is the key to success. Building on both research findings and the collective experience of the past two decades, we have developed the following seven-point definition of early-childhood-program quality that is essentially embodied in the Smart Start bill.[9]

(1) A child development curriculum, the most important component of quality, promotes sound intellectual, social, and physical development by providing a supportive environment in which children choose their own learning activities and take responsibility for completing them. They learn by exploring their environment with all their senses, both actively and reflectively. Rather than having to sit in desks, they are encouraged to move around the room and have access to a variety of toys and everyday materials.[10]

(2) Low enrollment limits and low staff-child ratios are hallmarks of good early childhood programs. According to the National Day Care study, a program expected to enhance the intellectual and social development of 3- to 5-year-olds should probably limit enrollment to 16 children, with 2 trained adults

in the classroom.[11] An enrollment limit of more than 20 3- to 5-year-olds could result in below-average intellectual development.

(3) Staff who are trained in early childhood development provide better programs as a result. The National Day Care study confirmed that adults do a better job of providing early childhood care and education for young children when they have the type of training that leads to early childhood college degrees and the competency-based Child Development Associate credential that is now flourishing in Head Start.[12]

(4) Supervisory support and inservice training. Administrators at all levels need to understand and actively support the goals and the child development curriculum of early childhood programs. They are especially responsible for the regular inservice training of early childhood staff in the day-to-day operation of a child development curriculum.

(5) Parent involvement. The staff of good early childhood programs are sensitive to parents' needs, seek to be partners with parents, and recognize the central importance of parents in children's development. Being partners means that parents recognize the staff as experts on child development principles, while staff recognize parents as the ultimate experts on their children's behavior, traits, and family background.

(6) Sensitivity to noneducational needs. Smart Start wisely recognizes the importance of full-work-day programs, since half of the nation's young children need such care. Further, Smart Start recognizes the needs of children living in poverty, by making available publicly provided meals and preventive health care and by helping parents find needed social services.

(7) Developmentally appropriate evaluation procedures. Valid, reliable, and developmentally appropriate observation procedures, ratings, and tests help early childhood teachers make decisions about a program's quality and the extent to which it enhances children's development of knowledge, thinking, social skills, and dispositions for learning.

A good early childhood program can take place in any setting that has adequate financial and physical resources and an adequate number of qualified staff--in a private home, center, nursery school, public school, or Head Start program. The basic definition of early childhood program quality applies to all these programs.

Early Childhood Care and Education in the U.S.

Today 39 percent of all the nation's children under 5--8.5 million children--receive some type of nonparental early childhood care and education. Of the 7.1 million children under 5 requiring nonparental care while their mothers are employed, grandparents and other relatives take care of 2.3 million; nonrelatives in private homes take care of 2.6 million; and child care centers and nursery schools take care of 2.2 million.[13] In addition, nursery schools and kindergartens serve 1.3 million 3- and 4-year-olds whose mothers are not employed.[14] Within these numbers, the identifiably public programs--Head Start and various public-school prekindergarten programs--serve 0.6 million children, only 7 percent of the total, but clearly a very important part if we are to assume greater public responsibility for such programs.

Most public funding for early childhood programs in the U.S. comes from the federal government--a billion dollars a year for the Head Start project, another billion dollars a year for various child care grants, and over two billion dollars a year in forgone taxes because families with young children use the federal dependent care tax credit.[15] Head Start, dubbed by William Safire of the New York Times "the crown jewel of the Great Society," has over two decades of experience in early childhood education for children in poverty.

Twenty-seven states now spend a total of about a third of a billion dollars a year on early childhood and parent education programs. The policymakers in most of these states have legislated the standards necessary for high-quality early childhood programs. Just five years ago in 1983, excepting California, only seven states spent a total of less than $15 million on such programs.

The Need for New Legislation

One of today's major domestic political issues is whether and how we will assume public responsibility for providing uniformly high-quality early childhood programs for the nation's children, especially those who live in the families who can least afford such programs.

Congress has the opportunity, through the Smart Start bill and through other bills considered by this Committee, to significantly upgrade the quality of early childhood care and education in this country. Despite the persuasive arguments for high-quality early childhood programs, especially for children who live in poverty, and despite significant governmental efforts, the majority of poor children in the U.S. still do not have this option.

We applaud you for proposing Smart Start. It embodies state-of-the-art knowledge about policies that will support high-quality early childhood development programs. It wisely embeds these policies in full-work-day, full-year programs that will meet the child-care needs of 4-year-olds. It builds on the recent movement in state legislatures that has led many states to institute state funding for high-quality early childhood development programs for 4-year-olds. By requiring interagency collaboration at both state and local levels (although, curiously, not federal), it recognizes the diversity that now exists in early childhood care and education.

Such diversity is a great strength of the early childhood field, but is also its Achilles' heel. If we were to start from scratch, we would surely create a unified delivery system that encompassed home care by relatives and nonrelatives, child-care centers, nursery schools, Head Start programs, and public schools. The salary structure would be unified and consistent with such comparable occupations as public school teaching.

As it is, the field of early childhood care and education is resource-starved and fractionated and can be contentious. The average annual salary of public school teachers, now $28,031, is three times the average salary for Head Start teachers and private caregivers.[16] Interagency collaboration is simply not enough when salary disparities are so great. Such is the case today in New York City's Project Giant Step, in which the same funding source serves the same clients either through public school programs or through child-development-agency programs that have drastically different salary schedules.[17] Smart Start must now suffer the effects of the very problem that its resources and framework may eventually resolve.

Computer programmers talk about "transparent" programs that, once they are installed, are scarcely detectable to the user when they are in operation. Perhaps Smart Start could become transparent in this sense--a program that provides resources, program standards, and an operating framework, but does not assume a separate identity as a new piece of turf to guard and to be guarded against.

The nation needs a strong, vibrant, and united field of early childhood care and education. The nation needs Smart Start, the Act for Better Child Care Services, and Head Start. These programs complement one another, and conflicts that may arise among them are capable of resolution.

This Committee should be proud of its record of leadership and accomplishment in the field of early childhood care and education. Now that the results of long-term studies are in, they show that the investment can be worth the risk. I urge you to build on this foundation and maintain the leadership you have already demonstrated to provide high-quality early childhood programs to all the children who need them.

Footnotes

[1] U.S. Bureau of the Census, Money Income and Poverty Status of Families and Persons in the United States: 1986 (Advance Data from the March 1987 Current Population Survey), Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 157 (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1987), p. 30.

[2] Lawrence J. Schweinhart, "The Preschool Challenge," High/Scope Early Childhood Policy Papers, 4 (Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Press, 1985).

[3] Ruth Hubbell McKey, Larry Condelli, Harriet Ganson, Barbara J. Barrett, Catherine McConkey, & Margaret C. Plantz, The Impact of Head Start on Children, Families and Communities, Final Report of the Head Start Evaluation, Synthesis and Utilization Project (Washington, DC: CSR, Inc., 1985).

[4] Irving Lazar, Richard Darlington, Harry Murray, Jacqueline Royce, & Ann Snipper, "Lasting Effects of Early Education: A Report from the Consortium for Longitudinal Studies," Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 47 (2-3, Serial No. 195), 1982.

[5] John R. Berrueta-Clement, Lawrence J. Schweinhart, W. Steven Barnett, Ann S. Epstein, and David P. Weikart, "Changed Lives: The Effects of the Perry Preschool Program on Youths Through Age 19," Monographs of the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, 8 (Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Press, 1984).

[6] W. Steven Barnett, "The Perry Preschool program and its long-term effects: A benefit-cost analysis," High/Scope Early Childhood Policy Papers, 2 (Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Press, 1985).

[7] Committee for Economic Development, Research and Policy Committee, Children in Need: Investment Strategies for the Educationally Disadvantaged (New York, NY: Author, 1987), p. 33.

[8] Donald E. Pierson, Deborah Klein Walker, & Terrence Tivnan, "A school-based program from infancy to kindergarten for children and their parents," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, (1984, April), 62, pp. 448-455.

[9] Lawrence J. Schweinhart, A School Administrator's Guide to Early Childhood Programs (Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Press, 1988). Deborah A. Phillips (Ed.), "Quality in Child Care: What Does Research Tell Us?," Research Monographs of the National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1 (Washington, DC: NAEYC, 1987). Ann S. Epstein, Gwen Morgan, Nancy Curry, Richard C. Endsley, Marilyn Bradbard, and Hakim M. Rashid, "Quality in Early Childhood Programs: Four Perspectives," High/Scope Early Childhood Policy Papers, 3 (Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Press, 1985).

[10] Lawrence J. Schweinhart, "Child-Initiated Activity: How Important Is It in Early Childhood Education?, High Scope Resource, (Spring, 1987), pp. 1, 6-10; reprinted in The NAMTA Journal, (1987), 12 (2), 75-84 (Cleveland, OH: North American Montessori Teacher's Association); reprinted as "How Important Is Child-Initiated Activity," Principal, (May, 1988), 67 (5), pp. 6-10.

[11] Richard Ruopp, Jeff Travers, Frederick Glantz, and Craig Coelen, Children at the Center: Summary Findings and Their Implications, Final report of the National Day Care Study, Volume 1 (Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, 1979), pp. 93-95; 158-160.

[12] Children at the Center, pp. 98-102.

[13] U.S. Bureau of the Census, Who's Minding the Kids? Child Care Arrangements: Winter 1984-85, Series P-70, No. 9 (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office), pp. 2-3. Published figures were multiplied by 115 percent to make the 1985 figure for "children under 5 of employed mothers" equal the 1987 figure.

[14] National Center for Education Statistics, The Condition of Education--1986 Edition (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986).

[15] Lawrence J. Schweinhart, "Early Childhood Development Programs in the Eighties: The National Picture," High/Scope Early Childhood Policy Papers, 1 (Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Press, 1985).

[16] National Education Association, Estimates of School Statistics, 1987-88 (Washington, DC: Author, 1988). U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Current Population Survey, March, 1984; Occupational Projections and Training Data, 1986 Edition, Bulletin 2251 (Washington, DC: Author, 1986). Head Start Bureau, Office of Human Development Services, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

[17] Robert C. Granger and Elisabeth Marx, Who Is Teaching? Early Childhood Teachers in New York City's Publicy Funded Programs (New York City: Bank Street College of Education, May 1988).

Senator **Dodd**. Well, I hope they hear you. And I would underscore your point about salaries. The lowest paid workers in the United States are clergy.

The second lowest paid workers in the United States are childcare workers. We pay more to have the tires changed on our automobiles than we will to have someone watch a child for several hours a day or more.

One begins to wonder about the sense of priorities. There are spaces for automobiles at your job, but only 750 businesses out of 6 million in the United States provide any spaces for the children of the people who work for them, and 500 of that 750 are hospitals. 250 businesses out of 6 million.

Now, granted, a lot of them cannot do it. It is ridiculous to talk about most small businesses providing on-site childcare. But nonetheless, one begins to wonder about where the sense of priorities is.

Sandra Lowe is the Executive Director of the Fairfax County Department of Community Action. She does not have testimony this morning, but Sandra, we welcome you and thank you for being with us this morning.

Let me just ask you very quickly, how did your community action Head Start choose the High/Scope as its curriculum, and no coaching from the person next to you.

Ms. **Lowe**. Thank you very much, Senator.

Actually, we investigated about seven different curricula. We decided that High Scopes, with it's cognitive nature, was more in line with what we were doing in our Fairfax County public schools with children K through 3. It followed the philosophy that we were looking for, and we selected that particular one out of a range of seven.

Senator **Dodd**. Again, you may have heard me. I presume all three of you were here with the last panel with Dr. Tirozzi and Ms. Boggus. We were talking about standards, and you all touched on this a little bit.

But a question that comes to mind, since you are dealing with Smart Start with people who are economically, in many cases, above the range of the people we are talking about in a Head Start program in many cases, do you still feel, all three of your feel, you have addressed this already, but do all three of you feel that the standards issue is just as important whether or not you move up, reaching to an economic area that is above the traditional Head Start family?

Dr. **Pierson**. I believe it is. I think certain standards are necessary. At this time you do not have a general awareness of what a sound developmental program is, and standards must be applied to consume the necessary outreach to certain families.

So I would support that across the board.

Ms. **Lowe**. Senator, we are very strong proponents of having quality requirements, and some oversight to make sure that those requirements are met, and that those standards are there.

We certainly feel that a lack of standards can indeed do some irreparable injury to children in the process, and we support strong standards wholeheartedly in Fairfax County. I think that is one of the reasons, our Head Start program has been cited as one of the quality programs in the country.

Senator **Dodd**. Well, let me again, we come back to this whole question of cost. I come from Connecticut, as you know. And Connecticut is the home of the insurance industry.

And one of the major problems and costs is the premium cost for these facilities.

Now I would argue today, and I have said so publicly, that I do not think the insurance companies are justified in charging the rates they do, even though, frankly, in a lot of States, the quality is less than desirable.

But one of the things I hope we will be able to accomplish with Smart Start, but particularly, with the ABC bill, by including standards, is that we will be able to lower premium costs, and simultaneously, be able to divert resource capacity to the people who work in these programs, so that the salary issue is affected directly by the standards issue, as is the overall cost of these programs.

So for those who are concerned about high turnover rates and low pay, and also, are opposed to standards of any kind, there is a linkage between those issues that cannot be avoided.

Again, I will emphasize, I think the insurance industry could do a far better job in evaluating the ability of various programs and the standards that they have set for themselves already, and reduce the premium cost.

In some cases, that has happened already, I must say; but not in enough cases. And I think it is deplorable. At any rate, I thank you again on behalf of the committee for being here this morning. We have statements from other members of the Senate which I am going to ask unanimous consent will be included in the record regarding this legislation.

[The prepared statements of Senators Stafford and Bingaman follow:]

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ROBERT T. STAFFORD FOR HEARING ON S. 2270 SMART START: THE COMMUNITY COLLABORATIVE FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1988

JUNE 10, 1988

MR. CHAIRMAN, I AM PLEASED TO JOIN YOU TODAY AT THE COMMITTEE'S HEARING ON SMART START. AS A LONG TIME ADVOCATE OF HEAD START, I AM PLEASED TO SEE MY COLLEAGUES IN THE CONGRESS TAKING SERIOUSLY THE NEEDS OF OUR NATION'S YOUNGEST CITIZENS. I RECALL THAT SEVERAL YEARS AGO THE OPTIONS PUT FORWARD FOR SERVING THE YOUNG WERE PRIMARILY GROUNDED IN EMPLOYER INCENTIVE PROGRAMS. MUCH HAS CHANGED. NOW WE IN CONGRESS ARE SEEING MAJOR LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVES DESIGNED TO EXPAND SERVICES TO PRESCHOOL CHILDREN.

BEGINNING WITH THE SECOND WORLD WAR THE LIVES OF AMERICAN FAMILIES CHANGED. NOT ONLY DID FATHERS LEAVE HOME TO BECOME PART OF OUR ARMED FORCES, BUT MOTHERS JOINED IN OUR NATION'S DEFENSE AS WELL. LEAVING THEIR TRADITIONAL ROLE AS HOME CARE PROVIDERS, MOTHERS ENTERED INTO THE WORKFORCE. THIS MOVEMENT OF WOMEN INTO THE WORKPLACE HAS CONTINUED. THE NUMBER OF WORKING MOTHERS HAS QUADRUPLED SINCE 1950. IF THE PRESENT TREND CONTINUES, AND WE HAVE EVERY REASON TO BELIEVE IT WILL, BY 1995 TWO-THIRDS OF ALL PRESCHOOL CHILDREN WILL HAVE MOTHERS WORKING OUTSIDE THE HOME. THESE CHILDREN DESERVE THE HIGHEST QUALITY CARE. IT IS NOT ENOUGH

INTELLECTUAL AND EMOTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND ONLY PAYS ATTENTION TO CHILDREN'S PHYSICAL NEEDS.

IF THERE IS WISDOM IN THE SAYING "AS YOU REAP SO SHALL YOU SOW," THEN THIS NATION'S STARTLING DROPOUT RATE SHOULD GIVE US ALL REASON FOR LONG, THOUGHTFUL REFLECTION. PERHAPS, IF OUR OUT-OF-SCHOOL AND OUT-OF-WORK YOUTHS HAD BEEN GIVEN BETTER CHILD CARE WHEN THEY WERE YOUNG, MORE WOULD HAVE STAYED IN SCHOOL. THE HIGH DROPOUT RATE IS A SAD COMMENTARY ON LOST OPPORTUNITY AND WASTED LIVES. IN THIS TIME OF HIGH BUDGET DEFICITS, WE IN CONGRESS ARE SPENDING A LOT OF TIME AND ENERGY FIGURING OUT HOW TO CUT COSTS AND SAVE MONEY. WHEN IT COMES TO SPENDING MONEY ON PROGRAMS FOR THE YOUNG, AN INVESTMENT OF FEDERAL FUNDS NOW WILL PAYOFF IN FUTURE SAVINGS. CHILDREN WHO HAVE QUALITY CHILD CARE AS YOUNGSTERS, PARTICULARLY LOW-INCOME CHILDREN, ARE GOING TO REQUIRE LESS FEDERAL SPENDING FOR WELFARE AND FOR THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM. BETTER EARLY EDUCATION RESULTS IN MORE CHILDREN STAYING IN SCHOOL AND A SOCIETY ENRICHED BY THE DEVELOPMENT OF THEIR TALENTS.

WE KNOW THAT INTERVENING EARLY IN CHILDREN'S LIVES, AND DOING SO WITH GOOD QUALITY PROGRAMS, CAN HAVE A STRONG POSITIVE IMPACT ON FUTURE ACHIEVEMENTS. THIS KNOWLEDGE COMES FROM SOLID RESEARCH IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION. FURTHERMORE, I KNOW AS A PARENT OF FOUR DAUGHTERS AND AS A GRANDFATHER AS WELL THE IMPORTANCE OF PUTTING OUR BEST EFFORTS INTO CARING FOR THE YOUNG. NO GROUP IN AMERICA IS AS VULNERABLE AS YOUNG CHILDREN, NO OTHER GROUP SO IN

AMERICA IS AS VULNERABLE AS YOUNG CHILDREN, NO OTHER GROUP SO IN NEED OF QUALITY CARE. FOR THESE REASONS, I AM COMMITTED TO STRENGTHENING EARLY EDUCATION INITIATIVES, MOST IMPORTANTLY HEAD START, A SUCCESSFUL PROGRAM SERVING LOW-INCOME, AT-RISK PRESCHOOLERS.

S. 2270 IS SIMILARILY DESIGNED TO SERVE PRESCHOOLERS. THIS BILL WOULD ALLOW FOR EXPANSION OF HEAD START, SOMETHING I APPLAUD, AND FOR CREATION OF NEW STATE PROGRAMS. FOR A LONG TIME I HAVE BEEN CONVINCED OF THE WISDOM OF INVESTING FEDERAL RESOURCES IN THE VERY YOUNG. I AM PLEASED THIS HEARING IS PROVIDING A FORUM FOR DISCUSSION OF THIS MOST CRITICAL ISSUE AND LOOK FORWARD TO FURTHER DEBATE AS THIS BILL AND OTHER INITIATIVESS ARE CONSIDERED BY CONGRESS.

#12

NEWS FROM

Jeff Bingaman
U.S. Senator

502 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510 • Contact: Jack Waugh, 202/224-6385, 202/224-5521

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JEFF BINGAMAN
SMARTSTART: THE COMMUNITY COLLABORATIVE FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT AND CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1988
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES
June 9, 1988

Mr. Chairman, thank you for allowing me to address the Committee on Labor and Human Resources this morning. I first would like to commend you, Mr. Chairman, for your tireless leadership in our efforts to improve the quality of life for all of our children.

I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of "Smart Start," The Community Collaborative for Early Childhood Development and Child Care Assistance Act of 1988, and to have the opportunity to participate in this hearing on pre-school education. For New Mexico's children and families, as well as for all Americans, an investment in pre-school education is a long overdue investment in this country's future. It will pay handsome dividends in the twenty-first century.

For some time, I have advocated the need for widespread, high quality early childhood development programs because I am convinced that such programs are of critical importance to the children in my home state of New Mexico and to the children and future of this nation generally.

Comprehensive, high quality education and care for our children always has been important, but in recent years it has become even more crucial to the long-term well being of our country. As trade relationships and economic trends lead to a more competitive, highly specialized world, I, along with many others, believe that a serious commitment to educational excellence at all levels is the key to continued American success and leadership in the global marketplace.

Without a doubt, our future success as a nation depends on our ability to equip all our citizens with the tools necessary to become productive, contributing members of our society. This means we must deal with a changing workforce, an outdated educational system, and the problems facing our children. We must recognize that for certain children, the problems are especially critical. I am speaking of children living in poverty. In New Mexico, one child out of every five lives in poverty, and children represent one third of the state's population. Nationally, poverty among children has risen sharply. There are almost 3 million more poor children now than there were in 1978.

Poverty inflicts a tremendous toll on children, but education gives them hope of a better life. Unfortunately, these children -- the children with the greatest need -- are the least likely to be enrolled in early childhood programs with an educational component. Their parents simply cannot afford it.

This troubles me because I know there is a direct tie between the quality of a child's education and the ability of that child to become a happy, productive, useful member of society. And the longer we as a nation wait to invest in our low-income children, the larger the consequences. We simply cannot afford to allow our youth to face a bleak future, because we all lose.

By providing full-day early childhood education and care to low-income children free-of-charge and to other children on a sliding fee scale, the Smart Start program would help upgrade existing education systems that do not currently meet the developmental needs of these children.

We know such programs work. Study after study has shown that quality, safe, supervised, and educational care eventually translates into well-rounded individuals, better school performance, lower drop-out rates, lower teenage pregnancy rates, lower unemployment rates, and lower crime rates. It means that 15 years later more children will go to college or participate in vocational and job training programs.

It makes sense that if our children get the proper nurturing and education during those critical early years, they likely will be that much more successful through the school years and beyond. Targeted intervention strategies, like Smart Start, work. But despite well-documented evidence of the positive effects of high quality early childhood programs, only a third of the poor children today are enrolled in early childhood education programs.

Last year, the Committee For Economic Development, a group of two hundred top business executives and other national leaders, released a report entitled Children in Need: Investment Strategies for the Educationally Disadvantaged. That report clearly states the problem facing us and offers workable solutions. The report says:

> "If present trends continue, the scarcity of well-educated and well-qualified people in the work force will seriously damage this country's competitive position in an increasingly challenging global marketplace. Our industries will be unable to grow and compete internationally because a growing educational underclass will lack the necessary skills and work habits to function productively on the job. Moreover, they will lack the levels of literacy needed to make informed choices about their lives or to take part in the political process."

The bill being discussed today, Smart Start, is just that -- very smart starting point. The CED report found early intervention, the goal of this bill, to be the most cost-effective way to solve the problem. The study reported that intervention before traditional school age, during a child's first five years, can alleviate many of the later problems. This bill addresses the issue directly by earmarking grants to states and localities to provide early childhood education programs to children before kindergarten, usually age 4. I believe that Smart Start complements existing programs, such as Head Start, and allows states to adapt and respond to local needs. There are minimum standards that the programs would follow that would guarantee truly high quality early childhood programs.

By both expanding and upgrading existing early childhood development programs or creating new childhood development programs, Smart Start would provide the funds that are so desperately needed. States would still have the flexibility to run these programs to meet local needs. Programs like the New Future School in Albuquerque, New Mexico could provide adolescent parents with comprehensive services, including parenting skills.

The bill's flexibility will enable states and localities to choose the type of program that best fits their individual needs -- whether that be through the public school system, Head Start, or community-based organizations. Along with this flexibility, states also must assume the responsibility for contributing matching funds to ensure the success of the programs. Still, the program is strictly voluntary, and while I hope that no state will choose not to participate, no state will be forced to participate.

I know there are many people -- both in the Senate and in the states -- who will say this bill and others like it are too costly. Without a doubt, cost is a significant factor and is one that must be carefully considered in these tight budgetary times. I have wrestled with this problem often. And I have concluded that despite what many see as too high start-up costs, we cannot continue to deny that early education and child care are national problems that must be addressed in a comprehensive way. I cannot emphasize enough the simple fact that these challenges must be met if we are to meet all of the other challenges we face as a nation.

Further, several studies have documented that every dollar spent for quality pre-school education can return up to $6 in lower cost for later education, for public assistance and for the criminal justice system. Even with our current budget deficits, I do not see how we can afford not to invest in quality education and child care.

Without adequate educational programs for our children and accessible, affordable child care services, valuable workers will be excluded from our work force, crippling our ability to compete in the world economy. We will be twice hurt -- losing parents who otherwise could work, and failing to properly nurture children who can help us rebuild American economic strength. For many families, day care is too expensive and early childhood education programs simply do not exist or are not affordable. Recognizing this agonizing decision parents face every day, Smart Start would be available to any pre-schooler whose parent wants to participate. Depending on family income, fees would be established on a sliding scale, from care provided at no cost to full cost.

An investment in quality pre-school education and care is an investment in our nation's future. It is an investment in New Mexico's children, in Wyoming's children, in Mississippi's children, in all of our children, that will pay off in stronger families, increased productivity in the workplace, and a healthier local, national and international economy.

Simply put, it is an investment we must make for our children and our future.

With these thoughts, let me again commend this Committee for organizing this third hearing on Smart Start and lining up the impressive witnesses testifying today. And I want to thank all the witnesses for enlightening us on this critical issue.

Senator **Dodd**. There may be additional questions for all of you.

We want to particularly thank our distinguished guests and visitors who are here this morning, sitting right in front of me here, from the program in Fairfax County, the Head Start program. We thank you for coming this morning. It was very nice of you to come over here this morning and be with us.

There will be, I presume, this additional discussion on this legislation in the coming weeks as we try and move. I will just tell you, I am determined to have ABC up before the floor of the United States Senate before we leave here this year and lay that one on the President's desk before he retires. I am just determined to do it. And hopefully we can include this kind of proposal as well, because I think it does complement ABC.

And Senator Kennedy could not be more supportive and more helpful on this effort and the parental leave effort as well. We are going to bring these family oriented issues to the forefront of the debate here in Congress and we are going to do it this year. So I thank all three of you for being here.

Ms. **Lowe**. Thank you, Senator. We applaud you for taking the leadership in this area.

Senator **Dodd**. Thank you very much. This committee will stand adjourned until further call of the chair.

[Whereupon, at 11:02 a.m., the committee meeting was concluded.]

○

89-066 (344)